

VOLUME XIV

SPRING 1954

NUMBER 2

*Public
Administration
Review*



THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY
FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The
merican Society
for
Public Administration
Science, Processes, and Art of Public Adminis-

WILLIAM W. PARSONS, President
LLOYD M. SHORT, Vice President
GENE BURCHFIELD, Secretary-Treasurer

THE COUNCIL

JOHN FISSELL	ALICE PERCH
SANT	JOHN A. PERKINS
GARLOCK	EMMETTE S. RADCLIFFE
HAUS	GEORGE A. SHEPHERD
L. LUKENS	CARL R. STOVER
MITCHELL	CHARLES W. TERRY
MODE	WILLIAM C. WELLS
NATHAN	THOMAS E. ZUBICK
OTERA	The President
	The Vice President

ADMINISTRATION REVIEW

DERRICK C. MOSHER, *Editor-in-Chief*
GENE BURCHFIELD, *Managing Editor*

EDITORIAL BOARD

L. DURISCH	VICTOR JONES
ENGELBERT	JOHN W. LEDELL
GALLAGHER	ARNOLD MILES
	EGRERT S. WENGERT

The Secretariat for the Society
is located by Public Administration Clearing House
of Public Administration Clearing House serves
Society and managing editor of *Public Adminis-*

Public Administration Review

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Volume XIV SPRING · 1954 Number 2

Metropolitan Government in Toronto	Winston W. Crouch	85
Balancing Good Politics and Good Administration	David L. Lawrence	96
State Administrative Reorganization in Michigan: The Legislative Approach	Frank M. Landers and Howard D. Hamilton	99
The Role of the Administrator in the Federal Government	Frederick J. Lawton	112
United States Representation at International Organizations, Geneva	Donald C. Blaisdell	119
Working Overseas for the United States Government	Milton M. Mandell	125
New Broom at the Town Hall?		128
Report of Conference Sessions		131
Contemporary Topics		152
Society Financial Statement, 1953		164

Published quarterly, in February, May, August, and November, by the American Society for Public Administration, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Entered as second class matter February 7, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1897, with additional entry at Brattleboro, Vermont.

The contents of *Public Administration Review* are indexed in Public Affairs Information Service, International Index to Periodicals, and Index to Legal Periodicals. They are microfilmed by University Microfilms.

Subscriptions: domestic, \$8 a year; foreign, \$3 a year. No discount to agents.

Annual membership dues: sustaining members \$15 or more; members \$8; junior members (those 28 years of age or under) \$4; student members \$4. Of the amount paid for membership dues, \$4 is allocated to the subscription to *Public Administration Review*. Address: American Society for Public Administration, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

PUBLIC POLICY: A Yearbook

Published under the auspices of The Graduate School of
Public Administration, Harvard University

The Graduate School of Public Administration announces that the publication of PUBLIC POLICY has been resumed. Volume IV (1953) ready now.

Prepared under the editorial direction of Carl J. Friedrich and J. K. Galbraith this volume contains a broad series of studies of public policy problems of immediate pertinence to the special interests of the administrator, the lawyer, the businessman, the economist and the political scientist. The next, Volume V (1954) to be published in June 1954.

LIST PRICE \$4.75

make checks payable to Harvard University

send to M-31 Littauer Center

Harvard University

Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Announcing the publication of

LETTERS ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

—from a Dean to his Graduates

by LENT D. UPSON

A public administrator's problems delightfully discussed in a series of essays. This book should be read by every governmental official—and the citizens who work with them.

Introduction by

LUTHER H. GULICK, *president*
Institute of Public Administration

Republished to meet the demand from those who are acquainted with the essays by the

CITIZENS RESEARCH COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN
810 Farwell Building Detroit 26, Michigan
178 pages, Cloth Bound Price: \$1.75

IN THIS NUMBER

WINSTON W. CROUCH has been a member of the faculty of the University of California, Los Angeles, since 1936, and director, Bureau of Governmental Research, since 1948. He has been a commissioner, Los Angeles County Civil Service Commission since 1948, and president since 1952. He is the author of articles on Canadian and English local government and author or coauthor of three monographs on metropolitan problems of Los Angeles.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE has been mayor of Pittsburgh since 1946. Other public positions have included secretary, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1935-39, and collector of internal revenue, Pittsburgh, 1933-34.

FRANK M. LANDERS has been associated with Budget Division, Michigan Department of Administration, since 1948, and is currently director of the division. He has also been a member of the staff of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget, the Michigan Department of Revenue, and the Michigan Tax Commission. He has an M.P.A. degree from the University of Michigan.

HOWARD D. HAMILTON has been an examiner, Michigan Budget Division, and research analyst, Michigan Department of Revenue. He has also had teaching experience in history and political science at the University of Illinois and Albion College. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois.

FREDERICK J. LAWTON has been a member of the U. S. Civil Service Commission since April, 1953. He was on the staff of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget from 1935-53, serving as chief, Financial Records Division, 1935-38; administrative assistant to the director, 1938-47; executive assistant to the director, 1947-49; assistant director, 1949-50; and director, 1950-53.

DONALD C. BLAISDELL was a member of the staff, Bureau of United Nations Affairs, U. S. Department of State, 1943-51; U. S. representative for specialized agency affairs, Geneva, 1951-52; and deputy chief, U. S. Resident Delegation to International Organizations, Geneva, and U. S. representative for international organizations affairs, 1952-53. He is at present visiting professor of political science, University of Florida.

MILTON M. MANDELL has been in charge of the work in administrative and management testing of the U. S. Civil Service Commission since 1945. He was previously chief analyst, President's Committee for Congested Production Areas, and held personnel positions in several federal agencies and in the city of Los Angeles.

Public Administration Review

Index of the Articles,
Reviews of Books and Documents,
and End Pieces

Volumes I-XII 1940-41 — 1952
\$3.00 58 pp.

American Society for Public Administration
1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois

ASPA Conference

March 18-20, 1955—Friday through Sunday

Hotel New Yorker, New York, N. Y.

Public Administration Review is intended to promote the exchange of ideas among public officials and students of administration. The various views of public policy and public administration expressed herein are the private opinions of the authors; they do not necessarily reflect the official views of the agencies for which they work or the opinions of the editors of this journal.

Metropolitan Government in Toronto

By WINSTON W. CROUCH

*Professor of Political Science
University of California, Los Angeles*

GRWTH of the suburbs, decline of the central city, multiplication of taxing units, and division of authority to cope with problems of transportation, drainage, air and water pollution, and other major problems of urban life are by now familiar themes in the story of metropolitan communities. The political scientist, the sociologist, the public finance expert, the lawmaker, and the administrator have studied diligently in recent years to find an answer to the problem of metropolitan government. Toronto has now embarked upon a notable experiment in this type of government that should be watched with the greatest interest. Canada's second largest city is the first big center of population in recent years that has been able to break through the blockade of intergovernmental rivalry and inertia and put in operation a government that has jurisdiction over an entire metropolitan area. The Toronto plan has much of political expediency in it, yet its features are based upon some deeply laid theories of local government.

Reorganization was a long time coming to Toronto, but when the present move started events followed each other in quick succession. On January 20, 1953, the Ontario Municipal Board proposed a scheme to the provincial Government for revamping the government of the Toronto metropolitan area. Premier L. M. Frost was attracted by the suggestions and caused legislation to be introduced at Queen's Park (the seat of the provincial parliament) which resulted in the passage of the now famous Bill 80.¹ On April 15 the Toronto Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan School Board members were sworn in at impressive ceremonies in which leaders of the province

and the metropolitan area participated. After seven and one-half months of preparations the new metropolitan government became fully operational on January 1, 1954.

Previous Efforts to Solve Metropolitan Problems

A VARIETY of interesting efforts has been made to cope with the gap of authority between municipal governments in the Toronto area. The city of Toronto expanded for a number of years by annexing territory as suburban growth occurred. This integrating effort stopped, to all intents and purposes, in 1912. Only one annexation of any size occurred after that date. This situation appears to have been the result of policies determined by city officers, supported by advice from city departmental administrators. Proposals for annexation were rejected as being too costly to the city unless the areas were completely built up and most of the municipal works already installed. Many cities have learned that growth by annexation is a costly business, but others, including Toronto, have learned that lack of annexation blocks one of the ways to deal with the problem of metropolitan government.

When annexation stopped, small municipal governments were organized to serve the suburban communities. The village of Weston became a town in 1915; Mimico and New Toronto became towns in 1919. In 1923 the large rural township of York was reorganized and a new North York created. In 1924 the township of East York and the village of Forest Hill were set up. In 1926 the village of Swansea was organized, and in 1931 the village of Long Branch was created. The townships of York, East York, North York, and Scarborough, all created for purposes of rural government, have

¹ *Statutes of Ontario.* 2 Elizabeth II, Chapter 73 (assented to April 2, 1953).

undertaken urban police protection, water supply, sewage disposal, and other urban functions to serve the communities that have grown up in their areas.

The separateness of the municipalities was somewhat reduced by the negotiation of inter-governmental contracts. Between 1915 and 1950 approximately 163 agreements were made between municipalities in this area.² Mimico and New Toronto operated a joint sewage disposal plant, Leaside and East York consolidated their public health services, and Leaside and Forest Hill were served water by contract with neighboring municipalities. The Toronto Transportation Commission entered into contracts with suburban municipalities to provide transportation facilities which connected with lines leading to downtown Toronto.

Two functional agencies that had been created by the province provided some metropolitan coverage in their respective fields. The Toronto and York Roads Commission is a device for selecting and financing suburban roads that have a metropolitan importance. Financing of this agency's operation was based upon the theory that the suburbs contributed to the wealth of Toronto and therefore the property wealth of the city should contribute to the cost of main roads in the suburbs. The city and York County contributed equally to the cost of roads selected by the commission; the province made additional grants to these projects. The Metropolitan Council has now replaced the city in this joint enterprise.

The Toronto and York Planning Commission was created for the purpose of encouraging and coordinating planning on a metropolitan scope, although each municipality had the responsibility for developing zoning ordinances, subject to provincial review and approval, and for planning its own development. The Planning Commission was discontinued when its functions were assumed by the new Metropolitan Board.

Some Factors That Influenced the Governmental Pattern

A NUMBER of features of geography of the Toronto area are meaningful to the new plan. Toronto, the oldest settled community

²Ontario Municipal Board, *Decisions and Recommendations of the Board* (1953), p. 20.

in the area, is located at the point where overland trails and travel routes on Lake Ontario originally met. The twelve municipalities that have been linked with it in the new Metropolitan Board are immediately adjacent. The thirteen comprise the built-up metropolitan community; some undeveloped fringe area is also included within the governmental boundaries. Six of the municipalities either front on the lake or have some access to it, although the city has the major frontage. The lake supplies the principal water resources for the area, and recent engineering studies recommend that wells which are now being pumped be closed down and the lake be used as the exclusive source. The lake is also the ultimate disposal site for treated sewage from the area. Steamers that ply the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River system of inland waters make Toronto a port of call. Major provincial and metropolitan traffic routes are influenced by the location of communities with reference to the lake. Major east-west routes parallel the lake and cut through the lake-front communities to arrive at the center of Toronto. The outthrust of metropolitan traffic from the city center, near the lake, is toward the suburban periphery and the rural area located in the direction of Lake Simco, an area that is the summer residence for a large percentage of metropolitan Toronto citizens.

Politically and administratively the city was independent of the county of York except for a few joint city-county arrangements for certain courts and jails and for the Roads Commission. The twelve suburban municipalities, however, were units of government within York County until the new plan became effective. These twelve municipalities that surrounded Toronto were separated from the other municipalities in York County by an agricultural belt, although some of that belt showed a marked ribbon development.

A brief description of county governmental organization and functions may make some of the problems that require discussion here more intelligible to readers in the United States. County government in Ontario has a two-tier structure. The County Council is composed of the reeve and deputy reeve (chairman and deputy chairman respectively) of each of the townships and villages. Normally cities are not in-

cluded within the county government. The County Council selects its own chairman, votes a county tax, and selects the heads of county departments. The county government provides courts and jails, records deeds and other records, provides public welfare and rural health services, and maintains county institutions. Policing has been provided by the municipalities; the small York County police force has been used for some years solely in connection with the work of the courts.

The Toronto metropolitan area is Canada's second largest urban area and is among the eight or ten major metropolitan areas in North America. The rate and trends of population growth show a pattern that is similar to that in many such great centers. Between 1945 and 1951 the population of the entire area increased approximately 15 per cent, yet during this period the population of the city declined from 681,802 to 675,754.³ The village of Forest Hill, which is small in territory and now heavily built up with residences for good-income dwellers, increased only from 13,960 to 15,305 in that same time. The great growth has been on the periphery of the area. The township of North York tripled in population, and the townships of Scarborough and Etobicoke doubled. Five townships which are operating under a rural-type government have city-size populations: York, 101,582; North York, 85,897; East York, 64,616; Scarborough, 56,292; and Etobicoke, 53,779. A large section of this population is employed in Toronto and shops in Toronto stores. It is the suburban overspill from the old, developed central city.

Peel County, on the southwest side of Toronto, is receiving some of the overspill from the center also. Communities that are springing up in this county adjacent to the major provincial highways are connected economically with Toronto. The new Ford of Canada plant at Oakville in Halton County is the largest element in the new growth in the neighboring counties.

The industrial prosperity which has been marked in the central provinces of Canada for the past seven years has bestowed its fruits generously upon Toronto and its environs. Toronto has been for several decades one of the

two leading banking and trading centers of Canada as well as one of the principal manufacturing areas. Even the summer visitor today will note the rapid construction of new factories and industrial enterprises in the Toronto area. A large share of this new development is in the peripheral areas of the York townships and Scarborough. The search for new land has caused the new plants to locate in the suburbs.

New subdivisions follow this development immediately, and the suburban spread goes on. Some of the suburban townships have actually found it necessary to deny permission to subdividers to open new tracts to sale because they could not undertake to provide water, sewage, and other governmental services. At least one suburb has experienced a water shortage during the summer months. On the whole, however, the municipal governments have done surprisingly well in providing the day-to-day services. The Ontario Municipal Board found that a good standard of performance had been maintained, although advisedly the yardsticks for measurement were more subjective than objective.

The city has been confronted with problems of redevelopment. Gradually, portions of the central area are being rebuilt, although urban blight is still evident. A recently constructed subway electric line should do much to speed downtown workers between their employment and homes. Traffic arteries are being cut through to accommodate automotive traffic needs. Cross-town thoroughfares are still important needs in Toronto. Traffic from Niagara and Hamilton is borne swiftly into metropolitan Toronto over the Queen Elizabeth freeway, only to become enmeshed in the cluttered local routes. Off-street parking for downtown workers and shoppers remains a subject of dispute within the city. Because it is the long established hub of the area, the city must consider needs of residents of the metropolitan area as well as those of its own residents in many matters.

The Move for Metropolitan Government

SOON after the close of the second World War interest in metropolitan government problems revived. In 1948, the Mayor of Toronto

³ Provincial estimates of population in 1953 show a similar trend in the metropolitan area.

and representatives of most of the adjacent municipalities met and requested the Civic Advisory Council, a citizen group interested in local affairs, to study and propose improvements in governmental organization and services. At approximately the same time the City Council also requested this organization to study provincial-municipal financial relations.⁴ In 1946 the town of Mimico had requested the Ontario Municipal Board to create an area for joint administration of services, but hearings on this proposal did not begin until January, 1950.

At that juncture several events that were related to metropolitan reorganization took place. The Civic Advisory Council made public its report which contained several alternative proposals,⁵ and the Toronto and York Planning Commission published a recommendation that eight of the larger municipalities be consolidated. The provincial Premier called a meeting of representatives of the city and its twelve suburbs to discuss several questions regarding reorganization. The town of Long Branch submitted to the Ontario Municipal Board a plan to amalgamate four municipalities, and the city of Toronto submitted a sweeping proposal for amalgamating most of the metropolitan area.

The Ontario Municipal Board is an administrative tribunal appointed by the province to hear applications and appeals regarding a number of municipal affairs. All matters concerning alteration of municipal boundaries and the transformation of a village to a town and a town to a city must be presented to the board. Municipal zoning ordinances require a hearing before the board prior to their final adoption, and municipal debentures must be approved by it. The powers of this tribunal are carefully defined by provincial legislation. Actions before it are somewhat formal and are argued by legal counsel. Briefs, documentary evidence, and engineering and other pertinent data must be submitted for study by the board members.

⁴ *Municipal Finance; A Report Prepared by the Civic Advisory Council of Toronto* (Toronto University Press, 1950).

⁵ *Report of the Committee on Metropolitan Problems, Parts I, II* (Toronto Civic Advisory Council, 1950) mimeo.

The applications of Toronto and Mimico were considered to be related proposals aimed at solving the same general problem and therefore were heard during the same proceeding. Mimico withdrew its 1946 proposal in favor of Toronto's plan and substituted a proposal for a limited functional consolidation with certain municipalities adjacent to it which was to be pushed if the board found the Toronto proposal unacceptable. Inasmuch as the Toronto plan proposed to disestablish the existing thirteen municipal governments and substitute one new over-all organization, the action before the board became in reality one in which the city was the complainant. The other municipalities, York County, the Toronto and York Roads Commission, and the Metropolitan Planning Commission became in a sense defendants in the action because their existence was threatened. Therefore the city was forced to try to prove that (a) government by the existing municipalities was inadequate and (b) amalgamation was the proper solution.

An advantage of a proceeding of this type before a disinterested body is that it encourages each of the interested governments to prepare and submit extensive data and arguments for consideration. Each contestant is likely to produce every bit of evidence that it can secure to support its contention. Reliance is not placed solely upon the thoroughness or ability of any one research staff in bringing out pertinent data. Presentations and arguments can be analyzed and rebutted. Merits of the proposals rather than promises of action are likely to be given most serious consideration. The shortcoming of this type of proceeding is that the board must limit itself to granting or denying the petition presented to it. Unlike a commission of inquiry it is not authorized normally to prepare a plan of its own which may either comprise parts of the proposals or be completely different from the plan presented by the petitioners.

The hearing before the Municipal Board was unusually long and detailed. It stretched over a year, although there were several recesses. Eighty-five witnesses were heard and nearly three hundred items of evidence were introduced. The board took the matter under submission on June 7, 1951, but was not able to announce its findings until January 20, 1953.

The board's findings were a surprise to many and were attacked by some as constituting an improper use of its authority under the statute. It concluded that Toronto had proved its contention that the existing system of local government for the metropolis was inadequate and should be revised, but it found the city's contention for amalgamation to be unconvincing. Therefore it rejected the city's application. Nevertheless the board found itself persuaded that it had sufficient evidence before it to warrant preparing a proposal for metropolitan reorganization which it submitted to the provincial Government and the Premier for consideration. Admittedly the board had no authority to direct the municipalities to adopt the plan. Legislation was required if the proposal were to be implemented.

The grounds upon which the board rejected the city's application are interesting and, to this writer, persuasive. One very practical reason for rejecting amalgamation was that it would be extremely disruptive and would require considerable time to change systems and procedures and to reassign municipal equipment, properties, employees, and the like. Because different standards and methods of administration had prevailed in the various municipalities, a tremendous effort would be required for a smooth amalgamation of the thirteen units. To bring all units up to the best standards immediately would be expensive.

Another reason for rejecting amalgamation goes even more deeply to the fundamentals of local government. To amalgamate an area having more than a million inhabitants and operating under thirteen governments would wipe out local affiliations and established local channels of communication. The Toronto proposal had visualized a single elective council as the governing body of the amalgamated metropolitan municipality. Under such a plan local political communities would have been eliminated or submerged in the sea of a metropolitan electorate. Advocates of integration have given too little attention to the values of the neighborhood and the community as bases for developing policy and as vehicles by which the citizen and voter may identify himself with his local government. Often in our efforts to escape from the provincialism and narrow out-

look of ward politics we have created such huge units of local government that the municipal citizen has come to think of municipal government as something vague, indented with a mysterious "they" in city hall. Even as integration has cured certain problems it has created new ones. Although the Municipal Board did not elaborate its reasons, it did indicate that one basis for rejecting amalgamation was its belief that a single elected council would be inadequate to represent satisfactorily so large a constituency. Such a change was regarded as too drastic for immediate use.

A Two-Tier Form of Government

THE plan that was proposed by the board and ultimately adopted by the Ontario Legislature, with modifications, was based upon a theory of federation. The city of Toronto and the twelve suburban municipalities were brought under a newly created Metropolitan Council composed of twenty-five members. Twelve members represent the city—the Mayor, two of the four controllers, and one City Council member elected from each of the nine wards.⁶ The twelve suburban municipalities are represented by the chairmen of their councils. The chairman of the Metropolitan Council during 1953 and 1954 is appointed by the Government of the province. Thereafter the chairman will be elected annually by the members of the council. The city and the suburbs were brought into the Metropolitan Municipality as complete units. The Metropolitan Council has been superimposed upon the existing layer of local governments.

The chairman selected by the provincial Government for the first two years is a man with broad experience in local government. Frederick G. Gardiner, a Toronto attorney and resident of Forest Hill, has been reeve of his village and has served on the York County Council. At the time of his appointment to the Metropolitan Council, he was chairman of the Toronto and York Planning Commission.

The new council is authorized to take over from the municipalities the water supply, treat-

⁶ Each ward elects two members to the City Council. The councilman in each ward and the two controllers who receive the highest number of votes for the respective offices serve additionally on the Metropolitan Council. All municipal officers are elected annually.

ment, and storage works, although it is limited to wholesale supply of water. The municipalities will continue to distribute water at retail. The council was directed to take over the sewage treatment works and to plan a system or systems of sewers that would serve the entire area. It may take over trunk line sewers and drainage lines, but municipalities will continue to be responsible for the local systems. The council may establish a metropolitan road system, subject to provincial approval of the routes. County roads within the new area are transferred to the council. One of the first duties undertaken by the new body has been to study proposals for freeways and major traffic routes.

In the health and welfare field the Metropolitan Council is given a status similar to that of a city under Ontario law. It becomes responsible for hospitalization of indigents and may make grants for construction and maintenance of public hospitals and sanatoriums. It shall take over the homes for the aged that have been operated by the city of Toronto and must pay York County for care of those aged persons in the county home who are from the council's area. It also shall take over the care of neglected children. The municipalities continue to perform most of the public health work.

The reorganization statute requires the council to provide a courthouse and jail which York County and the municipalities within the area may also use. The county is required to share in the cost of construction and maintenance of these buildings and to pay for care of prisoners. The city jail is transferred to the Metropolitan Council. The council also takes over the provision of the juvenile courts.

The council is authorized to undertake public housing and redevelopment projects, although it may not interfere with the exercise of similar powers by the municipalities. Planning is recognized as both a metropolitan and a municipal affair. The statute authorizes the provincial Minister of Planning and Development to establish a planning area which shall include the metropolitan area and may include other municipalities as well. A Metropolitan Planning Board is to prepare master plans covering such matters as land use, ways of communication, sanitation, green belts or

parks, and public transportation. Upon recommendation of this board the Metropolitan Council may adopt a metropolitan plan, subject to approval by the provincial minister. This plan becomes controlling upon the municipalities who must conform with its features in developing their own plans. The council may acquire parks, recreation areas, boulevards and drives, either within the metropolitan area or in adjacent municipalities in York and Peel counties. It may either take over existing parks or develop new ones.

Wherever the council takes over a park, sewer, water works, or other property from a municipality, it is not required to compensate the local unit but it is required to pay the interest and principal remaining on any debentures that have been incurred by the municipality in financing the project. In this manner the municipality is allowed to continue enjoying the use of the project that it constructed but it is relieved of the costs of maintenance and debt service. New projects developed by the Metropolitan Council will be financed from metropolitan sources.

Transportation has been recognized in the new scheme as a metropolitan responsibility. The Toronto Transportation Commission, which was created in 1920 to serve the city, has had its jurisdiction extended and its governing board expanded. All public transportation within the area has been brought under its jurisdiction and it is authorized to undertake the operation of any form of transportation that will meet the area's needs except steam lines and taxis. It may consolidate transportation systems and plan for future needs of the area. The Metropolitan Council will pay the interest and principal on debts incurred by the municipalities whose lines it takes over. An independent three-member commission directed the Toronto Transportation Commission when it was a city enterprise. That body is now expanded to five members, at least one of whom must be a suburban resident. In the future, the Metropolitan Council will appoint commissioners for five-year terms.

A reorganization of school units was also accomplished by the municipal federation bill. In the townships of North York and Scarborough several school jurisdictions were brought together and a township school board

was created in each instance. Other municipalities already had municipal school boards.⁷ A Metropolitan School Board was set up and organized on a pattern similar to the Metropolitan Council. The municipalities will continue to have municipal school boards, and the Metropolitan Board is required to make monthly school maintenance payments to each local board. The Metropolitan Board will set standards for school building needs and review local board plans for new facilities. The board is required to prepare an annual school budget for the metropolitan area, and it may include in the budget not only the maintenance expenses but estimates for permanent improvements that are to be financed from current income. If permanent improvements are to be paid for by borrowing, the board must pass upon the local board's proposals. School debenture proposals are also subject to review by the Metropolitan Council and by the Ontario Municipal Board. If the council disapproves a debenture, the school authorities may appeal the decision to the province. Thus, school operation remains a local function, but planning and review of construction needs and review of borrowing are brought within the jurisdiction of a metropolitan authority with final supervision resting in the province.

The "separate" school system, which in Toronto is operated in the interest of Roman Catholics and paid for, to a large extent, by taxes upon supporters of that faith, had been at least partially integrated on a metropolitan basis previously. The Toronto and Suburban Separate School Board was reorganized by a separate statute at the same time that the Metropolitan School Board was being created.

As the previous paragraphs reveal, the cost of certain selected programs having metropolitan significance has been shifted from the municipal governments to the new Metropolitan Council. The council thus becomes the coordinating authority that passes upon capital expenditures that are to be made hereafter within the metropolitan area. Furthermore, the basic legislation directs that debentures approved by the council to finance municipal projects in the future will be the joint obligation of the council and the municipali-

ties. The council is required to prepare an annual budget covering current expenses and debt payment requirements. Revenues then are derived from levies made upon the thirteen municipalities who must collect the levies and pay them into the council's treasury. Inasmuch as the responsibility for financing schools falls upon different groups because of the separate school systems, levies for schools must be calculated upon a different tax base than that used for the regular metropolitan government. Because the metropolitan government levies are made upon property, it is highly important that assessment of property for tax purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Council. Municipalities were relieved of assessment work on December 31, 1953. The province had previously prepared the way for this transfer and had created a Greater Toronto Assessment Board in 1951. The board directed a reassessment in the various municipalities in the area during 1953 which produced a considerable readjustment of assessments. The procedures employed previously by the several municipalities had not been uniform.

The New Council's Preliminary Efforts

THE Metropolitan Council is required by the statute to offer employment to all municipal assessors and to municipal employees in programs taken over by it. It is authorized to develop a personnel policy, including pension and sick leave plans. All employees and officers serve at the pleasure of the council. It was reported during the first months under the new plan that municipal employees, for the most part, were interested in transferring to council employment because the new agency offered an employment outlook that was better than that of most of the smaller local governments and at least as good as that of the larger ones. The opposition of municipal employees having entrenched pension and employment rights, that has blocked so many metropolitan reorganizations in other areas, seems not to have figured in Toronto. At least no disturbance has been reported. By January 1, 1954, it was estimated that the council had roughly 1,500 employees.

Shortly after the Metropolitan Council was sworn in it began the selection of top adminis-

⁷ The small municipalities along the lake front had a consolidated Lakeside District School Board.

trative personnel. The salaries offered were comparatively good and the challenge of the new work made it possible to recruit experienced local government administrators. The fact that some of the first top administrators selected were former city department heads caused a stir among some suburban politicians. However, the balance between city and suburban "representation" seems to have been maintained fairly well without sacrificing the principle of recruitment on merit.

The council has appointed four standing committees to study policy matters and to make recommendations to the main body on works, roads, planning and parks, and housing and welfare. Chairmanships of these committees were much sought after and again the city-suburban rivalry appeared. City members were made chairmen of the works and roads committees and suburban representatives were awarded the other two chairs.

An executive committee has also been established as a general steering body. The council chairman, the Mayor and a controller of Toronto, and the reeves of Forest Hill village and York township made up this committee during the initial period. A struggle over the powers of this group took place early. The first rule adopted was that finance recommendations made by the executive committee could be reduced or overruled only by a vote of two-thirds of the council membership, but this rule was soon changed to permit recommendations to be defeated by a majority vote. A two-thirds majority vote is required to increase an appropriation recommended by the executive committee.

Jealousy among the municipalities has flared at times, but a lining up of city representatives against a solid bloc of suburban members, sometimes rumored, seems not to have materialized. At one time it was complained that the village of Forest Hill had received an undue portion of high posts in the new organization inasmuch as three village residents held top positions in the new organization: Council Chairman Gardiner, School Board Chairman Long, and Reeve Charles Bick, who was a member of the council's executive committee. Before the first meeting of the council, it was rumored that Mayor Lamport had called a caucus of city representatives. This set off some angry state-

ments from suburban leaders. Months later it was rumored that the suburban members were holding secret caucuses. The reply was that suburban members had met to discuss common local problems, not to caucus on a stand to be taken in the Metropolitan Council. In spite of these bickerings the council work has progressed at a good pace.

The Plan Evaluated

ALL schemes for the organization of metropolitan government must be tailored to fit the needs of the area concerned. The Toronto plan has some features that are unique to it, or at least to Canadian local governments. There are other elements that offer great interest to other metropolitan communities. Features that have general interest must be evaluated, however, in the setting in which they are found.

Critical Comments

1. The area assigned to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Council does not coincide entirely with what may become in the relatively near future the area that is linked economically and socially with Toronto. The federated municipalities are entirely within York County, but developments in portions of Peel County are tied also to Toronto. This community of interest is recognized in the planning powers of the metropolitan organization but not in the other functions. Although it could be argued that the legislation could be amended to permit additional municipalities to join the federation, the very plan upon which federation was produced in 1953 would weigh against additions. The city and the suburbs are too nicely balanced in the membership of the Metropolitan Council to permit easy addition of suburban members.

2. Representation of population in the Metropolitan Council is completely out of balance. The city has slightly more than half the population of the area, and slightly less than half the votes in the council. Each suburb, however, has the same weight as any other suburb in the council, in spite of the fact that North York, for example, has a population of 85,000 and Swansea has only 8,000. Each ward in the city of Toronto has one member on the Metropolitan Council, although not all wards are

as populous as North York or Scarborough. If the present trend continues, and the suburbs grow while the city declines in population, will the new plan be berated as a rotten-borough scheme in ten years?

3. The functions assigned to the Metropolitan Council are specifically enumerated and the enumeration does not include all of the functions that are customarily regarded as having metropolitan significance. The functions that have been assigned to the council are predominantly those involving public works and capital expenditures. A function like public health is left in large part to the municipalities, and there is slight indication that thought was given to planning an integrated, rational program of public health services for the metropolitan area as a whole. Police work is another function that is usually integrated on a metropolitan basis, as in London and New York. Complaints in most metropolitan areas arise from the frustrations caused by too many police jurisdictions within the same large social community. The outsider may well ask Torontonians: Do you not have a Cicero, a Vernon, or an Emoryville in your metropolitan community to raise questions about the need for uniform police service?

4. The Ontario Municipal Board and the provincial government that sponsored the legislation evidently were preoccupied with establishing further controls over debentures to finance public works and with providing machinery to equalize the cost to metropolitan area property of public works that are required to serve the needs of rapidly expanding communities. Experience with municipal profligacy in the 1920's has caused Canadian provincial governments generally to tighten the financial controls upon local governments. As the Ontario Municipal Board reminded the readers of its Toronto proposal, Ontario municipalities lost their freedom to plan capital expenditures and borrowing in 1935.⁸ This act takes another step in the same direction.

5. The number of administrative reviews required for school and municipal debenture proposals establishes a time-consuming process. Furthermore, one may inquire, is the logrolling of ward politics to obtain public im-

provements now to be lifted one step up the ladder from municipal councils to the Metropolitan Council? What logrolling will be necessary for a suburban representative to obtain approval of locally desired projects by the works committee and the council? Already the reeve of Scarborough township has complained that the review process is slowing municipal initiative to meet needs produced by township development. It is undoubtedly too soon to evaluate the new plan in this respect. It may be that the reviewing process will permit metropolitan needs to be emphasized while leaving some initiative with the municipalities. There is a need for both views.

6. The new plan does nothing to improve the quality of performance of the smaller, and presumably less efficient, units of government. In the instance of water and sewer works the Metropolitan Council is authorized to set standards and to conduct inspections within the municipalities to assure that satisfactory standards are being maintained by the local governments, to the end that the metropolitan administration will not suffer from some local deficiencies. Assessment work has been taken away from the local units entirely, lest those units defeat the financial efforts of the Metropolitan Council. By relieving the municipalities of some obligations and by spreading the cost of those obligations over the greater financial base of the metropolis, the council may make it possible for some municipalities to afford a better standard of administration of the functions that remain at the local level. There is no guarantee in the plan itself, however, that this result will be realized.

7. To one set of critics the plan is simply an expedient effort to avoid a clash with the local political authorities by leaving them in their own bailiwicks and adding a new layer of government. There is bound to be a certain amount of duplication in staffing and in facilities for the performance of those functions where both the Metropolitan Council and the municipalities have authority. Transportation and tax assessment are the only functions that have been identified as exclusively metropolitan activities thus far. All others are mixed.

8. A possible difficulty in the new plan may arise from the fact that elective officials in the Toronto municipalities are elected annually.

* Ontario Municipal Board, *Decisions and Recommendations* (1953), p. 78.

Therefore the membership of the Metropolitan Council is renewed annually. Although it has been customary to reelect municipal officials for several terms, the system makes it possible for a substantial turnover to occur in the council each year and thus make the development of a consistent policy difficult. Several proposals have been discussed which would extend the terms to two or possibly three years. Under existing law the electorate of each municipality may vote upon a proposition setting the term of locally elected officers.

9. Metropolitan reorganizations often leave problems for the rural governments that have been cut away from the suburbs. York County now becomes a very much smaller county and must operate without the assessed value and the population of the Toronto suburbs. Although the Metropolitan Council is committed to paying debentures and interest on works taken over from the county, estimated at \$200,000, York County officials have claimed that they will face an overwhelming deficit. The county tax rate seems destined to take a sharp increase. Under the circumstances, the province will be looked to for financial aid to soothe the wounds caused by severance of suburban properties from the county. The province as a whole will then aid in Toronto's reorganization.

Positive Considerations

1. The combination of a provincial administrative tribunal that was willing to go beyond its strict terms of reference and a provincial government that had legal authority and political opportunity to produce a reorganization of metropolitan government was a key factor in the entire development. The Ontario Municipal Board admitted that it did not have the opportunity to study closely the working of metropolitan government in other areas, yet it was able during the course of hearings to obtain a wealth of information about the area under consideration.

The fact that the Government in power in the province had an overwhelming majority in the Legislature doubtless was a factor that influenced the decision to move rapidly with the legislation after the administrative board made its recommendations. Members of the provincial Legislature from the city of To-

ronto supported the bill, although municipal officials in the affected area were divided in several aspects. To the United States student of metropolitan government, the Toronto experience is most interesting. There was no urban-rural cleavage on the bill in the Legislature. There was no rural bloc of legislators to defeat an independently elected governor's proposal for metropolitan reorganization.

2. The machinery employed in accomplishing the reorganization was entirely that of representative government. Public hearings brought out information and the various rivals had opportunities to speak their lines. Fairly full publicity was given to proposals and discussions. Under the direction of responsible leadership in the provincial Legislature, an integrated plan of legislation could be considered and pushed to a successful vote. The groundwork had been accomplished, undoubtedly, by the prior studies and debates in the communities within the metropolis. The process used avoided many of the frustrations of annexation and consolidation elections where extravagant promises of municipal services are made to win votes.

3. The plan eschews the piecemeal approach that is involved in setting up a series of metropolitan authorities to deal separately with transportation, water, parks, sanitation, education, traffic, and the like. Finance and construction policies of the transportation authority and the metropolitan school authority are brought into conformity with metropolitan government needs through the power of the Metropolitan Council to review the authorities' proposals. The policies of the transportation and planning authorities will be correlated with the council's outlook on metropolitan problems by reason of the fact that their governing boards are appointed by the council.

4. The Metropolitan Municipality, as the new government is styled by the statute, is a municipal corporation having most of the standing of a city in Ontario law. There is thus provided a legal framework which may be shaped to suit the needs of the area. The functions that were given it are extremely important and are sufficiently difficult to keep the new council fully occupied for some time in shaping the necessary policies. When experience shows that more functions should be

transferred to the council, the transfer can be made by provincial legislation.

5. The designation of the key officials of the constituent municipalities to the Metropolitan Council has some novel, and debatable, features. Elected municipal officials are, as a class, considered to be part-time officers. Duplication of responsibility may put undue burdens upon some of them. The Mayor and controllers of the city are full-time officers; however, others devote varying percentages of time to their duties. The reeve of Scarborough has been quoted as calling himself "Mr. Scarborough" and declaring that he works twelve to sixteen hours per day on township business. The demands upon Metropolitan Council members' time can be serious, although it may well be that judicious use of the committee system can reduce the burden upon the greater number.

The plan would appear to have advantages, however, over one wherein separate candidates are elected to the metropolitan body, as in London. The official who serves primarily as a municipal officeholder (i.e., a mayor or reeve) will be better informed on the policy and administrative problems of the unit he represents. He is likely to bring to the metropolitan body a richer experience and knowledge than the person who stands for election to the metropolitan body independently. The Toronto

scheme avoids much of the dichotomy between the metropolitan and municipal governments. It fosters a dual loyalty which should prevent any tendency to throw blame on one or the other levels of government or to excuse the failure of one to act by claiming that it is the responsibility of the other. Toronto may possibly go later to the direct election method as some have suggested. If it does, the present plan will have been an effective means for getting a metropolitan government started. During the initial period, the Metropolitan Council has been able to move effectively because its members are experienced in the ways of local bodies and in the meeting of municipal problems.

In the last analysis, the most satisfying tests of a plan of the magnitude of that of Toronto are: Will it work? And can it be made to produce results that the previous system did not produce? Although the Toronto plan has been in operation but a limited time, the manner in which the council has approached its assignments indicates that these questions can be answered in the affirmative. Much speculation could be made regarding what plan might have been better than the one adopted. It is cheering, however, to see a community led out of a frustrating deadlock and proceeding industriously to make a new plan work.

Problems in Public Policy

This series has, from the beginning, been dedicated to the principle that in the realm of public policy there are no economic problems, no political problems, no legal problems; there are merely problems. These problems have economic, political, legal and other aspects. It is the beginning of wisdom for the student as well as the practitioner of public administration that departments and disciplines leave off where action begins. We hope that the contributions to this volume are informed by this precept.

—From the preface by Edward S. Mason to *Public Policy: A Yearbook of the Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University, 1953*, edited by C. J. Friedrich and J. K. Galbraith (Graduate School of Public Administration, 1953).

Balancing Good Politics and Good Administration

By DAVID L. LAWRENCE

Mayor, City of Pittsburgh

IN OUR time, we have seen an enormous change come to pass in both politics and public administration. The role of government in our national life has enormously increased, and there are no signs anywhere, no matter what the party platforms and campaign orators may say, that it is in any way going to diminish. There are too many inevitabilities in our domestic social structure and in the world we live in. They simply can't be exorcised with speeches and pious hopes. There is no roll-back to the past.

Government cannot drop its concern with housing and the reconstruction of urban areas. Government cannot withdraw from the world system of alliances, from economic and military aid to our allies, from the United Nations, and from the terrible peril of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs. Government cannot neglect the social security program, the complexities of labor relations, the extension of equal opportunities to all races and conditions of men, and the economic prosperity and national productivity upon which our strength as a people rests.

It is against such a background and in such an age that politics and public administration must be practiced in the communities and states. They, too, are not what they were. Too much has happened, and the actions are irreversible. The simple spoils system has retreated into fewer and fewer areas of government. The old-time political machines, based solely upon patronage and privilege, have just about expired everywhere. Complex government has to have competent technicians, and you seldom find a city planner or a tubercu-

losis control expert who is also a party committeeman. The anguished cries coming out of Washington, as disappointed spoilsman discover the hard facts of today's political life, are an evidence of what has happened. So is the decay of the big city political organizations, which were usually Democratic, and the big state political organizations, which were usually Republican. Both parties have had their bumps.

Now this does not mean, I am sure, that government and public administration have been granted a bed-and-board divorce from politics and the political parties. Nor do I think it would be a good thing if they were. A democratic society cannot put all its trust in professional administrators any more than it can in any other limited group of people. The expert can become as hard, as unyielding, and as dead wrong as the toughest type of political boss.

There are two easy ways to administer a public office of importance. One of these easy ways is to make the office an adjunct of the political party, to make every decision a political decision, to fill every place on a measurable return in votes, to trust to district politics alone as a source of strength, and to hang on to power for the sake of power. Then everything is clear and uncomplicated and everyone knows what to expect. The other easy way is to put the administration completely outside of the party system, to ignore every consideration except the administrative principles that are taught in the rule books, to give the experts their heads—and let them crash into each other as they go in opposing directions. That method too is simple and uncomplicated, and everyone knows what to expect.

NOTE: Excerpts from a paper presented at the meeting of the Pittsburgh Area Chapter ASPA, Dec. 17, 1953.

The virtues of simplicity in these two concepts are there, all right, but they are cancelled out by the sure failure that each will bring. Administration for the sake of politics alone is negative, and will not serve the needs of our times. Thus, it is sure to fail. Administration by the rule book alone, untempered by a knowledge of people and an unwillingness to work with human beings as we find them, is cold and heartless—and will inevitably be rejected by the community. People seek recognition as individuals, not as numbers in a report, and they will properly turn to those administrators who can keep things in the human scale. And in that human scale, the American people weigh very heavily their political allegiances and their individual prerogatives as citizens and voters. Let us hope they always do.

They expect a Mayor, a Governor, the President to exert political leadership as well as administrative direction. They may admit that public administration is a science. They have long known that politics is an art. They expect a successful administration to blend the two in the public interest, so that the things they expect from their government will be forthcoming. In today's public life, success must depend upon the achievement of the major objectives to which almost all of us subscribe.

In the national government, these would be the maintenance of a free world and the defense of our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and the maintenance of prosperity, full employment, and a rising living standard in the nation. In the city, the major objective would be the solution of the problems of urban living and the development of the great potential for a better community life which we all know exists. To these ends, the public administrator must be willing to use his public powers, the political party to which he belongs, and every other source of community strength within his grasp.

The best public administration, in detail, will not save a community which is withering because its major problems are not being successfully attacked. The canniest political leadership will serve no good public purpose if it does not put itself wholeheartedly into the cause which the political party is organized to serve—the advancement of the people who vote

it into responsibility. Neither the politician nor the public administrator will find it always easy to keep his long-range purpose before him at all times. The world is full of short-term people, who would sacrifice any true objective for a burst of temporary popularity. I put the legislator, the lobbyist, and the all-around demagogue who is for all appropriations and against all taxes at the very top of this list.

But based on long years of experience, I have a comforting feeling that life usually catches up with such fakers and that the main prizes, which they so avidly pursue, consistently evade them. They may hang on to a minor office; they seldom make the top job. Given a fair amount of time, the people recognize the hard realities of life for what they are and they recognize those who would deceive them as to facts as unworthy of serious trust.

Pressed by sheer necessity, Pittsburgh is about to levy an earned income tax which we have fought off for twenty years. The basic reason is inflation. We have simply run out of revenue sources, and nothing else that is not self-destructive will serve us in our need.

To this moment, I have not heard a single person say that we should eliminate specific services. Nobody has said we should close our tuberculosis or our polio hospital. Nobody has said we should close our parks and playgrounds. Nobody has said we should quit collecting garbage and rubbish as a municipal service. Nobody has said we have too many policemen or too many firemen or too many school crossing guards. In the recent campaign, the opposition's chief argument was that we had too many holes in the streets and that our water system needs extensive repairs—both of which statements are unfortunately true; in fact, we said so first. Nobody has said publicly that city employees should not get a cost-of-living raise, or that the city should stop paying prevailing union wages. But nobody except the Mayor and Council has had the elementary courage to advocate any form of taxation which would accomplish all these things and keep the city solvent. Well, that is what they elected us for, and we will not shirk our jobs. And in the long run, the fair-weather fellows, who are flying with the prevailing winds, will gather round and pretend they stood firm in the cause, battled shoulder-to-shoulder with

us for the right. That happened in the power strike back in 1946. It happened in the siege that brought us smoke control. And it will probably happen again.

All of this is what I talked about a few minutes ago—tempering public administration with an understanding of human nature. Before this group, where many of you are from Pittsburgh's suburban communities, I would think a little discussion of our city-suburb problems would not be amiss. There may be a hysterical rush to cut in on Pittsburgh's revenue sources. The law permits that; the municipalities have the right to take advantage of it. It may be wishful thinking—or wistful hope—but maybe one can hope for a little consideration as to what Pittsburgh, the central city, does for this whole area. We have the only health program that is worthy of the name. We have the only library system of reference quality. We have a parks system, with the zoo, the conservatory, the aviary, that is the pride—not of Pittsburgh alone—but of the whole tri-state district. We bore the whole brunt of sewage treatment planning. We carry hundreds of millions of dollars of tax-exempt property of agencies that serve the whole district—the universities, the hospitals, the federal building, and all the rest. We handle the traffic that

makes it possible to go from one suburb to another. We make it possible for the majority of people in the district to earn their living. We keep this area from being a scattered collection of municipalities—all shapeless body and no head.

We like our neighbors and speak well of them, and return to them far more than we get from them. We support the county government out of all proportion to the direct return to us. We show, I trust, none of the jealousy that too often turns up in the public statements of officials of the communities outside Pittsburgh. I cannot think of one municipality in Allegheny County that has not had generous and broad-scale treatment at the city's hands. So I think we have a right to ask our suburban communities not to cut off their noses to spite our faces, without thinking at least twice before they do it. At any rate, we in Pittsburgh are not going to falter. We are going to keep up our record-breaking progress. We are going to keep up our public services. We are going to administer the city so that it will go forward, and not retreat into failure and decay. I don't know if it is good politics. I do know that it is our duty as administrators for the public—for the future as well as the present—and we are not afraid to do our duty.

The Administrator as Leader

If administration is to be leadership and not command, then it were well that the high echelons of hierarchy were Escoffiers or Rembrandts, sensitive to the flavor and shades of coloring in the group relationships. Such leadership requires not just an understanding of the organizational interrelationships of the hierarchy. It requires some knowledge of the psychological dynamics of group behavior, of belief systems, of status values, and of the learning process itself. The administrator who is a leader must also be a teacher. For such leadership he requires not only formal education in administration but also apprenticeship and on the job training.

—James Marshall, "Spirit and Function of Organization," in Lyman Bryson and others, (eds.), *Freedom and Authority in Our Time; Twelfth Symposium of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion* (The Conference, 3080 Broadway, New York 27, 1953), p. 13.

State Administrative Reorganization in Michigan: The Legislative Approach

By FRANK M. LANDERS

Michigan Department of Administration

and HOWARD D. HAMILTON

Michigan Department of Revenue

DURING the past few years, under the influence of THE Hoover Commission, some 30-odd states have been busily engaged in surveying their administrative structures. Because of the spectacular publicity that surrounded the federal effort, most of the state surveys have been conducted by "Little Hoover Commissions," consisting of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of the government and of the general public. In some fourteen states, the responsibility for the survey was vested in a legislative committee or in the state legislative council.

Michigan is one of the states which has entrusted this task to a committee known as the Joint Legislative Committee on Reorganization of State Government. The committee has been in existence since 1949. Despite a tremendous volume of research reports, its accomplishments to date, in terms of enacted legislation, have not been spectacular. However, it may be too early to judge the final product as the Joint Committee is continuing its efforts and may succeed in finally achieving some substantial results.¹ The following brief report and analysis of the Michigan experience is designed to describe the method of approach, the nature of the studies, and the reasons why the results, thus far, have not been commensurate with the effort.

¹ This article was written in the fall of 1953. Since then the Michigan Legislature has held its regular 1954 session. Although bills were introduced on seven major issues, none was approved, so the situation remains as here described.

The Michigan Scene

MICHIGAN's state government is an interesting study in contrasts of the old and the new in government. The state has one of the most comprehensive civil service systems in the country—a system that is endowed with plenary constitutional powers. It has a number of large departments which span their respective functions, are well organized, and have commendable records of service.

Since 1919, the state has had central staff agencies performing budgeting, accounting, purchasing, motor transport, building engineering and management, and property management functions. In 1948, these were combined in a Department of Administration which has furnished the Governor with the essential "tools of management" (except personnel) for effective direction of the administrative branch and which is serving as a model for current reorganization proposals in other states.²

The other side of the picture shows a jungle of 115 agencies, headed by a mixture of elective and ex-officio boards, full- and part-time commissions, elected officers, and appointive department heads, including a plural executive device, the State Administrative Board. Authority and responsibility are dispersed, confused, and obscure. The structure is incredibly and unnecessarily complex, and in terms of direct authority and administrative control, the Governor is chief executive in name only. For years, students of government have urged streamlining, and every Governor

² See John A. Perkins and Frank M. Landers, "Michigan Seeks Better Management," 21 *State Government* 184-88, 196-97 (September, 1948).

since World War I has sought improvements by reorganization.

Organizing the Present Reorganization Study

THE current reorganization study differs from preceding Michigan surveys in its magnitude and from those in most of the other states and in the federal government in its official composition. Michigan has a "Little Hoover Committee" rather than a "commission"; it is a joint legislative committee to which a "representative" of the Governor was added as an observer.

The exclusion of the executive from the study reflects the condition of legislative-executive relations. A long standing hostility between Governors and the Legislature has been augmented since 1949 by different party affiliations of the Governor and the legislative majority. The exclusion also reflects a hypothesis that legislative distrust and jealousy of executive sponsorship of previous reorganization efforts has been a principal cause of their failure to materialize into statutory enactments. Also there has been the belief that "continuity" is greater in a legislative body than in the executive office. Two recent experiences have been cited to support this approach to reorganization.

In 1938, Governor Frank Murphy sought to initiate a comprehensive reorganization by the creation of a Commission on Reform and Modernization of Government to which he named a galaxy of ninety prominent Michigan citizens. The commission convened, discussed, made some preliminary recommendations, and requested that the Legislature support the effort by enacting a statute and providing adequate funds. Four months later Governor Murphy was out of office, the Legislature rejected the recommendations and request for an appropriation, and the commission expired.

Again in 1948, Governor Sigler, who for months had been decrying the fact that the Governor was "little more than a clerk," appointed a committee (composed entirely of legislators) to study state reorganization. Although he did not attempt to dominate the work of the committee, the Governor made it clear that he believed in strong, centralized

administrative machinery directly under the chief executive. This advocacy of "centralization" was criticized by a number of the legislators. Further, the election in 1948 of a Governor of the opposition party convinced the 1949 session that it should do nothing to enhance gubernatorial authority.

These developments in the Michigan reorganization scene led some proponents of reorganization to believe that the open-sesame lay in exclusive legislative responsibility and action. Hence, the friends of reorganization, particularly those associated with the Citizens Research Council of Michigan, pinned most of their hopes on the Joint Legislative Committee on Reorganization of State Government. In this approach Governor Williams has cooperated by meticulously avoiding any appearance of influencing the Joint Committee's deliberations and by applauding the survey and directing all agencies to cooperate with the Joint Committee's research staff.

The prime mover in the current effort, until July 1, 1953, when he formally tendered his resignation (not yet accepted) has been Loren B. Miller, head of the Citizens Research Council of Michigan and research director for the Joint Committee. He organized the research staff; a Citizens Advisory Committee consisting of 45 members, 15 of whom were selected by the Governor and 30 by the committee; and an Advisory Management Panel consisting of 22 prominent government and business executives who were occasionally consulted by the research staff.

To provide adequate finances for an ambitious program of research, Mr. Miller secured grants totaling \$60,000 from several private foundations to supplement a \$20,000 state appropriation. In addition, the committee was the beneficiary of the donated services of most of the experts on the task forces. For example, it has been estimated that 2,100 man hours—240 working days—were contributed in preparation of the staff report on Michigan health agencies. All told, it has been estimated that the total "costs" of research have been well in excess of \$250,000.

The Staff Reports

IN CONDUCTING the Joint Committee's research, Mr. Miller followed the pattern of

the Hoover Commission. He organized 30 task forces, to each of which he assigned responsibility for a function or a group of related functions or agencies. Actually, most of the staff reports were largely or entirely produced by one individual. The division of work, the names of principal authors of reports, and their major recommendations are listed at the end of this article.

Examination of the staff reports reveals that, contrary to the announced policy of studying only the administrative structure, many of the task forces undertook a review and criticism of administrative methods and procedures, and even of the wisdom of particular activities. This license produced mixed results. Indubitably, it caused some valuable information and recommendations vis-à-vis nonorganizational matters to be issued; on the other hand, it may have the deleterious effect of encouraging legislative committees to delve into many administrative details which ought to be handled by administrators.

A striking aspect of the current study is the similarity of the principal recommendations of the staff reports to the recommendations of the surveys made in 1920 and 1938. The similarity indicates that the fundamental defects in Michigan's administrative structure are not obscure. Their existence has been known for thirty years, and the proper remedies have been suggested by preceding surveyors.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the whole study is the fact that the research reports rate several of the agencies as doing outstanding work in spite of the organizational jungle. The staff reports have been particularly complimentary of the Administration, Conservation, Corrections, Health, Highway, and State Police Departments. Not all of these reports, however, have been favorably received, especially by the Legislature and the critics of reorganization.

To illustrate, two staff reports which created something of a furor were *Personnel Administration*, by Louis Friedland, and *Fiscal Policy Administration*, by A. E. Buck. Mr. Friedland took the view that the State Civil Service Commission, clothed with plenary powers by the constitutional amendment of 1940, has performed effectively its control functions, but, because of what he described as an Olympian

status, has been woefully deficient in the performance of service functions. The commission has "kept the rascals out" and has enabled the merit principle to become firmly established, but a true merit system should include "high standards for all phases of personnel administration." Also he was uncomplimentary of many of the commission's policies and procedures.

As a remedy Friedland recommended essentially the same formula that the Hoover Commission recommended for the national government. He proposed that responsibility for personnel administration be vested in a single personnel director, serving at the pleasure of the Governor and responsible for servicing all agencies with a merit system. The commission should continue to have "watchdog" functions, with responsibility for rule making, appeals, payroll certification, and designing the classification system, and, in conjunction with the Legislature, for prescribing salary rates. Thus Friedland recommended furnishing the Governor with the one major "tool of management" omitted in the Department of Administration Act of 1948.

Friedland's report shocked the Civil Service Commission and many friends of the merit principle, who asserted that his observations were erroneous and that any "tampering" with the Constitution would reopen the door to the patronage wolves. The disagreement rests on first principles: How secure is the merit principle in Michigan? Would the reorganization contain adequate safeguards of the merit principle? What are the proper functions of a central personnel agency?

A. E. Buck was highly critical of Michigan's "hodgepodge of fiscal initiative and authorization." Constitutional limitations, tax sharing formulas, and dedicated revenues have placed the Legislature in a veritable strait jacket. The methods of the Legislature in handling financial legislation are obsolete and bungling; the efforts of the Legislature to tie the hands of the Governor in the administration of the budget are amateurish, blind, and time-wasting; and the State Administrative Board and Emergency Appropriations Commission ("Little Legislature") are fifth wheels which create friction, confuse responsibility, and should be abolished. "The fore-

going fiscal agencies represent a motley aggregation, which tend to confuse and cancel out each other's authority . . . neither has a justifiable place in modern state organization.³

Buck's blistering critique made the Capitol reverberate; many infuriated legislators wanted to hatchet the Joint Committee. However, it may be noted that Buck merely said in forceful language what others have been saying for years.³

Since the Legislature has an extensive role in administration, a task force considered this subject. The report, *The Legislature*, prepared by Richard Ware, Ralph Michener, and Hubert Stone, offered suggestions for handling fiscal matters, reviewing administrative rules, and providing general surveillance of administration. Its recommendations included reduction of standing committees, provision for more public and joint hearings, establishment of staffs for the more important standing committees, expansion of the Legislative Service Bureau, holding of annual sessions, and creation of a legislative auditor general who would make both performance and financial audits and would report to a standing joint legislative audit committee. The report applauded the review of administrative rules and regulations by the standing Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, but recommended that the committee cease operating like a court hearing cases of aggrieved parties and confine itself to considering the validity of challenged rules and regulations, i.e., determining whether a rule is within the legislative expectancy of the statute which it amplifies.

Buck had also urged the Legislature to cease tying its own hands by establishing restricted funds and dedicated revenues; to eliminate administrative restrictions from appropriations; to establish a joint legislative committee; and to use an omnibus appropriation bill in order to avoid piecemeal fiscal legislation. He also noted that the elected auditor general has incompatible duties (post-audits and assorted administrative functions), and recommended abolition of that office and creation of a legislative auditor general. Other problems relating to the Legislature, such as apportion-

ment and terms, were of course beyond the purview of the research staff.

Proposed Structure

THE structure which would result from adoption of the proposals of the various task forces is charted by Loren Miller in the concluding staff report, *General Management of Michigan State Government*. The current 115 administrative agencies would be consolidated into 40 or 41 agencies, of which 6 would have elective heads. The elected officials would be the Governor, lieutenant governor (actually a legislator), secretary of state, treasurer, highway commissioner, regents of the University of Michigan, and Board of Agriculture in charge of Michigan State College. The attorney general, because of his intimate relationship with the Governor, would be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor. The auditor general would be supplanted by a legislative auditor general and the superintendent of public instruction would be replaced by a commissioner appointed by the State Board of Education, which also would be appointive rather than elective as at present. The report also recommends that all elected officials have four-year terms and be elected in nonpresidential election years.

With the exception of the members of the Civil Service Commission, the central staff officials—attorney general, controller (in charge of the Department of Administration), director of personnel, and chief hearing officer—and personnel of the executive office would be appointed by the Governor and serve at his pleasure.

There would be three ex officio boards and thirteen boards and commissions appointed for long, staggered terms. Only three of these would have charge of substantial departments—the departments of education, veterans affairs, and development and promotion. The rest would be responsible for small agencies, some with almost perfunctory duties. (Seven commissions were beyond the jurisdiction of the research staff.)

Fourteen large line departments would be headed by single directors, appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate for terms concurrent with the term of the Governor. These would include the departments

³ Cf. Arthur Bromage, "Restrictions on Financial Powers of the Legislature in Michigan," 20 *State Government* 141-43, 153 (May, 1947).

of agriculture, aeronautics, civil defense, commerce, conservation, corrections, employment security, health, industrial relations, liquor control, military, professional licensing and regulation, social welfare, and state police.

To each of these departments, except state police and the military, would be attached citizen advisory councils appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate for eight-year staggered terms. These councils would observe and appraise the performance of operating functions; propose, review, and approve policy (with final determination resting with the director); and report to the Governor and the Legislature (and thereby to the public) at least annually.

These proposed responsibilities and powers are broader than those of most advisory councils, which are prone to desuetude, and rather resemble those of a nineteenth century board of visitors. If such councils can avoid the Scylla of meddling in administrative detail and the Charybdis of lapsing into dormancy, they can provide valuable citizen participation and some interest representation. They can also help to execute the transition, for many departments, from a plural to a single executive.

The State Administrative Board, Michigan's unique plural executive, would be abolished. Its duties and functions relating to over-all supervision, inquiry, and direction, which are seldom exercised, would be lodged in the chief executive, and its multitude of purely administrative activities would be vested in appropriate existing agencies.

Any pattern of administrative organization, no matter how good, needs frequent modification in order to adapt it to changing conditions. The concluding recommendation of the final report, adopted from the successful federal experience, is that the Governor be authorized by statute to prepare from time to time and submit to the legislature reorganization plans, not involving the Constitution, which shall become effective after sixty days if not disapproved by either house of the Legislature. This device, which reverses the roles of the Governor and the Legislature in the legislative process, might, if adopted, prevent the state administrative structure from ever again

becoming so outdated as to require a drastic overhauling.

The Citizens Advisory Committee endorsed the blueprint developed by Mr. Miller and the task forces with two major exceptions. Objecting to the effort of educators to separate the school state from the political state, it recommended that the Department of Education be headed by an appointive director who would have the help of an advisory council. It also felt that the duties of the secretary of state, treasurer, and highway commissioner do not justify the election of these officials and recommended that they be made appointive.

Implementation

ACCOMPLISHMENTS to date in putting into effect the recommendations developed by the staff reports, as reviewed and approved, or modified, by the Citizens Advisory Committee, are somewhat negligible. In the four years and four sessions of the Legislature since the Joint Committee was organized, a number of bills have been prepared or introduced. Most of these, especially those of a fundamental character, died either before being thrown into the legislative hopper or in committee after introduction. A few major and several minor recommendations have been adopted. It is significant that in many instances parallel developments unrelated to the reorganization effort furnished much, if not most, of the impetus which led to the adoption of these changes.

Annual instead of biennial sessions of the Legislature were authorized by constitutional amendment in 1951. As a matter of fact, since World War II the Legislature had been meeting at least once each year. Moreover, adoption of the so-called "sales tax diversion" amendment to the constitution in 1946 practically guaranteed annual sessions.

The Department of Administration was authorized to institute a records management program and operate a records center. The center was set up in 1952 in rented quarters, and in 1953 the Legislature appropriated \$300,000 for the establishment of a state-owned facility. This was one of the most successful efforts of the Joint Committee. The significance of its report and recommendation was dramatically highlighted by the catastrophic fire which, fed by files of dead records

in storage areas, raged through the state's office building in early 1951 shortly after the committee report was published.

A Bureau of Elections was established in the office of the Secretary of State, a reform stimulated mainly by the disclosures, in the 1950 gubernatorial election recount, of lax, although not dishonest, local election administration.

The 1953 session of the Legislature enacted two important measures. It centralized all aspects of driver and motor vehicle licensing in a division in the office of the Secretary of State, taking responsibility for driver license examination away from the State Police. It also reorganized the Corrections Department. The principal features of the corrections reorganization were the reversion from a director to a commission (in contradiction to the staff report recommendation), authorization of a Youth Division, and separation of the Parole Board (but not its staff) from the department. The last two changes were in accordance with recommendations of the Joint Committee. Undoubtedly, the costly riots at Jackson Prison in 1952 played a major role in bringing about the changes in the Corrections Department, but the committee recommendations were made before the riots and the committee can therefore properly take credit for the accomplishment.

Among the minor accomplishments to date are transfer of the licensing of maternity hospitals from the Social Welfare Commission to the Health Department; placing the state police pension fund upon a sounder actuarial basis; eliminating the inspection by the state police of kerosene oil and Christmas trees; and clarification of relationships between the Health and Agriculture Departments relative to milk inspection.

On the administrative side, as the several task force reports were published, the Governor called upon the agencies involved to review the findings and recommendations and submit memorandums on the extent to which proposed changes requiring only administrative action were being instituted or the reasons for rejection. The Governor held a series of meetings in order to ensure that all valid proposals were adopted. In this way numerous minor administrative changes and improve-

ments were accomplished. The principal government-wide development was the creation by the Governor of a State Personnel Council patterned after the Federal Council, as recommended by the Friedland report.

Some steps backward must also be noted. Paramount objectives of the reorganization studies, particularly Staff Report No. 30, were to clear out the jungle of agencies, to replace commissions in line departments by single directors, and to strengthen the Governor's position so that the state might be served by a moderately strong executive. Now there are 115 instead of 114 agencies. The reorganization of the Corrections Department reestablished a commission at the top, contrary to the first recommendation of the staff report. The Governor's administrative authority is, if anything, slightly weaker. The only official to benefit materially from reorganization changes to date has been the secretary of state, a principal rival of the Governor, who has acquired new functions and two new divisions and has lost none of the functions and divisions which other staff reports have recommended should be taken away from him.

In July, 1953, Mr. Miller stated that in four years twenty changes had been made and added that the record "can hardly be called impressive, when laid alongside the job still remaining."⁴ However, the Joint Committee has recently met again and laid plans for another effort in the 1954 legislative session. Although there is no noticeable trend toward improvement, it is possible that the next session or two might produce some substantial accomplishments.

Obstacles to Reorganization

THE causes of the relative lack of accomplishment to date are numerous. Some are rather obscure and difficult to assess. Without reference to order of importance, the following factors may be noted: the disinterest of most legislators and even some members of the Joint Legislative Committee in reorganization; the aspiration of several legislators to hold state administrative offices that would be abolished in any thorough reorganization; the long existence of legislative-executive conflict; the prevailing party situation; the Michigan

⁴ Lansing State Journal, July 29, 1953.

tradition of a plural executive, exemplified particularly in the State Administrative Board; the allegedly widespread distrust of a strong, unified executive branch; the lack of any strong popular support for reorganization; the inability of reorganization to produce any substantial or dramatic reduction in government costs; the exposed political position of the Governor; the reduction in patronage resulting from reorganization; and the opposition of many special interest groups.

It would appear that foremost responsibility for the present stalemate rests on the Joint Legislative Committee. Although the chairman and a few members have been seriously concerned, other members have not been enthusiastic for the kind of reorganization proposed by the staff reports. Few of the committee members have conspicuously supported reorganization proposals in the Legislature. The bulk of the recommendations of the research staff have never even reached the bill stage. In its action, or nonaction, the Joint Committee is a reflection of the parent body.

There are a number of roots to the intense opposition of the Legislature. Some of these are old and some are new; some are personal and some are institutional. In the first place, as has been noted, there is the interest of legislators in election to state administrative offices. For years these elective offices have represented the next rung of the political ladder. This strong vested interest of legislators in the perpetuation of several elected administrative offices, and thereby a divided executive branch, reportedly was influential in a decision of the Joint Legislative Committee not to endorse the staff proposal for abolition of the auditor general.

A second vested interest of legislators in the atomization of the executive branch stems from the propensity of legislative committees to dabble in administrative matters. As in many states, the practice of administration by legislative committee is long established in Michigan. The more dispersed the executive structure the greater the opportunity for legislators, especially members of the appropriating committees, to exercise an important voice in agency affairs.

Dominating the Legislature's antagonism to reorganization is the distrust of executive au-

thority and a tradition of legislative-executive conflict. As Mr. Miller points out, the present hodgepodge of government agencies is largely the handiwork of the Legislature. Distrust, jealousy, and fear of the executive have produced the present fragmentation of executive authority. The traditional pattern of legislative-executive relationships in Michigan is one of rivalry, even when the Governor and the legislative majority are of the same party. At present, the rivalry is intensified by the party situation, which further militates against successful reorganization. The pattern of rivalry appears to stem largely from legislative resentment of gubernatorial initiative and leadership in legislation.

A substantial part of this legislative distrust of the executive arises out of lack of information on the part of the Legislature. As pointed out in the study, *The Legislature*, much of the suspicion with which legislators view the administration probably would vanish if they had their own officers (for example, a legislative auditor) who could keep them informed on what the administrative branch is doing. Agencies such as the Department of Administration have been set up to serve the Governor as chief executive. Obviously, they cannot serve both the executive and the Legislature. The remedy for the Legislature is not to cripple the Department of Administration, but to develop its own instrumentalities, such as an auditor selected by and responsible to the Legislature.

The State Administrative Board

PERHAPS in no state is the tradition of a plural executive more deeply entrenched than in Michigan. In addition to the usual spate of elective department heads, each with constitutional status, there is the State Administrative Board, an ex officio body composed of elective department heads, the Governor, and the lieutenant-governor. Since its creation in 1921, the Legislature has invested it with one duty after another, with the result that it now possesses an amazing assortment of powers and responsibilities. Its powers have waxed or waned depending upon the condition of legislative-gubernatorial relationships. Currently, all members of the board except the Governor belong to the same party as the

legislative majority, and the prestige of the board is at a high point, at least with the Legislature. It passes on all construction, lease, and printing contracts, many purchasing contracts, the settlement of small claims against the state, the settlement of state claims against private parties, and the payroll vouchers of some agencies. It formally "approves" the annual budget allotment schedules of all agencies and passes on every allotment adjustment. In addition to the foregoing and other specific powers, the board has broad over-all authority of supervision, inquiry, and direction.

The board's functioning has the distinct merit of fully displaying the state's financial business to public view. Some state business may also benefit from focusing upon it the collective wisdom of the board. The first value, and probably the second, could be realized by alternative institutions.

Miller, Buck, and other political scientists have been critical of the board on a number of grounds—that it is ill suited to perform a mass of administrative detail; that it deprives the Governor of essential general supervisory power and the assistance of a genuine cabinet; and that it is a perfect instrument for confusing, concealing, and evading responsibility and for breeding internal friction and dissension. A casual examination of the board's minutes shows that the bulk of its activity consists of performing petty administrative details which would not do honor to a village council and that it handles most matters in a perfunctory, rubber-stamp fashion. References to it as a cabinet are clearly erroneous.

The long existence of elective administrative officers and of the Administrative Board are formidable obstacles to any effective reorganization. In addition, some of the elective administrative officers have been the most vigorous and able opponents of reorganization.

Interest Groups

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES are a major source of opposition to any reorganization. It is understandable that they do not want to lose functions, to reorganize internally, or to lose independent identity. Without saying much overtly, for that might be impolitic, unsympathetic agencies can generate strong resistance.

Opposition of agencies would be less formidable were it not for the support of their respective clienteles. Thus the sportsmen clubs have condemned the proposal of the research director and the Citizens Committee to abolish the Conservation Commission; the Farm Bureau opposes the abolition of the Agriculture Commission; and the organized veterans oppose the major recommendations of the task force report on veterans' affairs. If the Legislature should move to vest the functions of the Historical Commission and State Library in an expanded Department of Education, as recommended, one could expect a deluge of resolutions from women's clubs and local historical societies. These various interest groups, firmly wed to the present structure in which they wield influence, see only the limited area of their respective interests rather than the over-all picture.

Unfortunately, the more comprehensive reorganization proposals are, the more interest groups are affected and alienated. Even if the interest groups are "for reorganization" in the abstract they are against it in the particular, and, expressing their prejudices, they can readily cancel out or stymie the whole effort. In Michigan, some of the interest groups do not even pay lip service to the objective of reorganization.

Lack of Popular Support

INERTIA and the abstract and obscure nature of the problems of administrative structure constitute strong barriers to any reorganization effort. It is difficult for the average citizen to comprehend or get excited about such problems. He is interested in what the government does or does not do, not in the way it organizes to do.

Perhaps popular apathy is partially attributable to the fact that previous reorganizations have been oversold by exaggerated claims of economy. It would seem that Michigan citizens know from experience that administrative reorganization does not produce dramatic savings. Piecemeal reorganizations in the past have paid off in more and better service but not in reduced expenditures.

The opponents of reorganization have been exploiting a misconception of strong administrative organization. One state official labels

the proponents of reorganization "monarchs." He does not point out that what he describes as "monarchism" prevails in many of Michigan's better governed cities, as well as in several states, and has existed in the national government since 1789. Another prominent ex-official warns that "too efficient" government will eat holes in the people's liberties. Others say that executive integration will weaken the Legislature. These arguments, which tend to confuse the terms integration and centralization, appear to carry weight with the public which has little comprehension of the abstract problem of executive unity, of short ballot theory, and of the fact that the reorganization controversy, in many phases, is a power struggle within the executive branch.

The nub of this controversy is well presented in two quotations. Criticism of reorganization proposals designed to produce a governmental structure integrated under and responsive to the direction of the Governor has been offered by State Treasurer D. Hale Brake, a long-term opponent of centralization.

The argument for centralization is that of greater efficiency. Undoubtedly, the most efficient government in the world is a dictatorship, if the dictator is efficient. The whole argument for high centralization presupposes at the head a top flight executive, and if, instead, we presuppose at the head of a government a person of mediocre ability, or a spoilsman, or a puppet operated by stronger forces from behind the scenes, then the whole argument for centralization *falls flat on its face*.⁵

In reply to Mr. Brake, Loren Miller has written:

This cry about dictatorship is nothing more than an emotional appeal to prejudice. To maintain that clearly established lines of authority and responsibility in the executive branch create dictatorship is absurd when the governor must stand before the people on his record and can only operate the executive branch with appropriations from the legislature. . . . Efficiency is a hoped-for by-product, but the chief purpose of reorganizing is to achieve greater responsibility and accountability of the government to the people.⁶

The creation of the Citizens Advisory Committee was designed to generate popular sup-

port. That committee was to serve three functions: to improve the quality of proposals by analysis and criticism of the staff reports, to serve as a barometer of public opinion *vis-à-vis* each staff proposal, and to develop popular support through the prestige of the committee members and through their active promotion of the effort.

Apparently the first objective was realized. The Citizens Committee held a number of meetings, at personal expense, to review the research reports as each was completed. The committee's views reportedly did influence the research staff on occasion. Although rejecting some staff recommendations, and discreetly refraining from judgments on many recommendations relating to technical administrative procedures, the Citizens Committee generally went down the line in unequivocal endorsement of the major staff recommendations. Indeed, it went beyond the staff on two significant points.

The objective of serving as a barometer of public opinion on the staff recommendations probably was an illusion. By reason of its composition, the committee probably was more favorable to reorganization than the public. Furthermore, by reading the reports and listening to research staff members, the committee became informed of the values of reorganization to a degree that the public never can become informed.

The third objective was only partially realized. The committee's endorsements indubitably resulted in some popular support at the time they were made, but in the two years since the committee wound up its work and disbanded its influence has evaporated. The committee members individually have done little or no campaigning. Far more conspicuous and vocal have been the opponents of reorganization. After the Advisory Committee disbanded, a few of its members incorporated as the Citizens Committee for Government Reform. This organization has done nothing, however, and the only result of its establishment to date appears to be the antagonizing of members of the Joint Legislative Committee on Reorganization who denounced it as a "pressure group."

Position of the Governor

IN VIEW of the fact that earlier, piecemeal re-organizations in Michigan, as in other states,

⁵ Speech at Michigan Press Conference, January 26, 1952.

⁶ Memorandum to Michigan Newspaper Editors, February 28, 1952.

have been the result of strong gubernatorial leadership, the question arises of whether the Governor should support the present effort with concerted pressure or should confine himself to the general endorsement and cooperation mentioned above. The position of the Governor is highly anomalous. Although he is in a position where he is more acutely aware of the need of reorganization than anyone else, and although his office would be the foremost beneficiary of reorganization, he is checked by three strong inhibitions.

One inhibition has already been noted. The Governor has followed a meticulous hands-off policy in the hope that the Legislature, if given an exclusive role, may accomplish something significant.

A second inhibition has resulted from the desire to keep reorganization "out of politics." Thus far it has been kept "out of politics" in the sense that party leaders have studiously avoided making it a campaign issue. However, the most active opponents of reorganization are prominent party leaders. Partisan feeling surely reinforces the opposition of the legislative majority to reorganization, probably inclines the legislative minority to be more receptive to reorganization.

The third powerful inhibition to leadership by the Governor is the fear of exposure to charges of bossism and dictatorship. Since some of the major reorganization proposals would enhance the Governor's administrative strength, and these are the only reorganization proposals the public ever hears much about, strong pressure by the Governor for reorganization likely would produce charges of power hunger. As a result, the Governor and the reorganization movement might both suffer.

It may also be noted that prior to 1940 Governors had the important lever of patronage for obtaining legislative support of administrative reform which the incumbent lacks. Enactment of a statutory civil service system during the Murphy administration allegedly was purchased in part by outright bartering of highway department jobs. The adoption of the civil service amendment to the Constitution in 1940 cut the Governor's patronage to the vanishing point. Hence, ironically, one of the obstacles to administrative reform is the fact that Michigan got a very heavy shot of civil service medicine in 1940.

Conclusion

THE current Michigan experience appears to contain a few morals.

1. The deliberate exclusion of the executive branch from reorganization studies is unwise. It lowers the quality of some of the research, without the corresponding compensation of ensuring adoption of proposed remedies. Indeed, it probably diminishes the chances of adoption.

2. The reorganization survey should be under an aegis which will enable the Governor to support it vigorously without exposure to the charge of personal thirst for power.

3. In selecting members of the reorganization commission an effort should be made to secure members who are seriously interested in achieving the most efficient organization and who will work for it. Unless the members are thoroughly convinced of the merits, and are willing to undertake the long, tedious effort necessary to accomplish the desired results, there is little hope for reorganization via legislative channels.

4. Reorganization requires careful, extensive, and sustained cultivation of public opinion, a task which may demand skill and effort by the reorganizationists beyond the production of research surveys.

5. Many state officials have a vested official and personal interest in opposing reorganization.

6. Prerequisites for reorganization are at least a modicum of respect and cooperation between Governor and Legislature and some appreciation by the Legislature of the administrative task of the Governor and the values inherent in an integrated executive. Many legislators and officials, and, seemingly, the public, simply do not comprehend this problem.

7. Thoroughgoing, wholesale reorganization proposals run the peril of treading on the toes of a number of interest groups which are likely to join forces against them. In an environment such as prevails in Michigan currently, probably a piecemeal approach to reorganization is best. In such an approach only one or two interests are pinched at one time. This approach also offers little opportunity for alarmist charges of precipitous change and tyranny.

Research Staff (Task Force) Reports

No.	Subject	Principal Author	Major Recommendations
1	State Police	Bruce Smith, Inst. of Pub. Admin.	Make police commissioner directly responsible to Governor and removable by him rather than Supreme Court (done by P.A. 253, 1952). Increase pension fund appropriations (done).
2	Workers and Employment	John Perkins, Pres., Univ. of Dela.	Consolidate labor agencies into department of employment security and industrial relations, each headed by a single gubernatorial appointee, with an autonomous workmen's compensation appeal board.
3	Pension Admin.	Edward Dubpernell, Off. Auditor Gen., Detroit	Establish a joint board covering all state pension plans: state employees, state police, Michigan public school employees.
4	Veterans' Benefits	George W. Smith, Off. Auditor Gen., Detroit	Create a department of veterans' affairs to administer all programs of veterans assistance, including those now administered by veterans organizations and local communities using state funds.
5	Professional Licensing and Regul.	Frank M. Landers, Mich. Dept. of Admin.	Establish a department of professional licensing, headed by a director serving at the Governor's pleasure. Abolish 16 licensing agencies, replacing them with professional advisory committees appointed by the director.
6	Revenue Admin.	Irving Tenner, Fiscal Consultant, Chicago	Replace elective auditor general by a legislative auditor restricted to post-audit. Create a centralized treasury department with three divisions: custody and investment, revenue, local government. Abolish Tax Appeals Board.
7	State Election Admin.	James W. Miller, Mich. State College	Establish a department or bureau of elections, headed by a state director of elections (done by P.A. 65, 1951). Reconstitute State Board of Canvassers.
8	Health Agencies	Milton E. Muelder, Mich. State College	Create an office of health affairs to absorb: Departments of Health and Mental Health, Crippled Children and Tuberculosis Commissions, Hospital Survey Office, and some inspection functions of Departments of Agriculture and Labor, headed by 7-member council which should appoint the commissioner.
9	Personnel Admin.	Louis Friedland, Wayne Univ.	Vest personnel administration in a personnel director serving at the pleasure of the Governor. Create a personnel council (done by executive order, 1952). Restrict Civil Service Commission to rule-making, audit, and appeal functions. Increase slightly the number of exempt positions in large departments.
10	Fiscal Policy Admin.	Arthur E. Buck, Inst. of Pub. Admin.	Establish a joint legislative committee on the budget. Reduce restricted funds and use an omnibus appropriation bill. Retain Department of Administration as constituted. Abolish Emergency Appropriations Commission (Little Legislature). Eliminate role of State Administrative Board in budgetary control.
11	Legislature	Richard Ware, Ralph Michener, Mich. Citizens Res. Coun.; Hubert Stone, Conn. Pub. Expend. Council	Replace auditor general by a legislative auditor. Create a joint audit committee. Restrict Administrative Rules Committee to consideration of validity of new rules. Adopt annual sessions (done, 1951).
12	Liquor Control Comm.	Hale G. Knight, U. S. Atomic Energy Comm.	Pattern LCC after federal regulatory bodies (Miller recommends single director). Have two divisions: merchandising, licensing and enforcement. Continue wholesale monopoly. Make examiners responsible to commission.
13	Dept. of Agriculture	Norman Krause, Agric. Coll., Univ. of Ill.	Retain the commission. Make director an appointee of Governor, if latter's term is raised to four years. Reorganize internally. Transfer inspection of dairy and food products to Health Department.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW

No.	Subject	Principal Author	Major Recommendations
14	Driver and Vehicle Services	J. O. Mattson, Automotive Safety Foundation	Consolidate all such activities in one department or a division of the Department of State (partially done by P.A. 215, 1953).
15	Dept. of Corrections	Donald Clemmer, Dir. of Corrections, D. C.	Continue single commissioner responsible to Governor. Divorce parole board, but not its staff, from department. Establish youth authority division (latter two points done by P.A. 232, 1953).
16	Conservation Agencies	Philip Cornick, Inst. of Pub. Admin.	Retain present organization: Conservation Department under a commission, and three small commissions (Mackinac Is., Water Resources, Soil Conservation). Citizens Committee urged abolition of small agencies and Conservation Commission.
17	Educational Agencies	Alonzo G. Grace, New York Univ.	Abolish elective superintendent and Board of Education. Establish an appointive board and commissioner. Vest department with authority over all state schools but University and M.S.C., library, and duties of historical commission.
18	Records Mgt.	Emmett J. Leahy, Natl. Records Mgt. Coun.	Establish a records center and a division in Department of Administration to administer a thorough records management program (done by P.A. 118, 1952).
19	Highway Dept.	Arthur Bushell, former deputy highway commissioner, Conn.	Establish a large highway commission; abolish elective commissioner. (Citizens Committee favored single commissioner appointed by Governor.) Continue county maintenance of trunk-lines. Develop a long-range trunkline plan.
20	Property Inventory and Control	Paul D. Sullivan, Off. of Auditor Gen., Mich.	Dealt exclusively with changes in administrative methods and procedures.
21	State Functions in Local Property Taxation	Philip Cornick, Inst. of Pub. Admin.	Abolish State Board of Assessors, Board of Equalization, and Tax Commission; transfer their personnel and duties to a division of local government, Treasury Department. Transfer property tax duties of auditor general to same.
22	Purchasing Div., Dept. of Admin.	Robert Ralston, Conn. Pub. Expend. Coun.	Transfer authority over printing contracts from State Administrative Board to Purchasing. Establish interdepartmental committee on standardization.
23	Promotional Agencies	Aris A. Mallas, Mich. Citizens Research Coun.	Establish a department of development and promotion under a director to supplant nine commissions: Waterways, Tidewater, Economic Development, Cherry, Apple, Tourist Council, Soo Locks Centennial, State Fair, U.P. Fair.
24	Dept. of Social Welfare	Eldon Sneeringer, Mich. Citizens Research Coun.	Make the director an appointee of the Governor; replace the commission by an advisory council. Within each county merge bureau of social security, now administering categorical aids, and the local department of welfare. Relieve probate courts of child welfare duties; abolish county agents.
25	Building Engin. and Mgt.	Arthur Edwards, Detroit Building Owners and Managers Assn.	Combine Divisions of Building and Property Management of Department of Administration. Organize into two sections: planning and construction, building management; and two staff units: office, research and testing.
26	Military Establishment	Aris A. Mallas, Mich. Citizens Research Coun.	Abolish the military board and the chief of staff. Place the Establishment under an adjutant general, appointed by Governor. Abolish the naval board and naval force, a paper organization.
27	Motor Pool, Dept. of Admin.	William W. Williams, Detroit Edison Co.	Continue present organization and revolving fund. Several recommended procedures have been adopted.
28	Regulatory Agencies	Tilden B. Mason, Mich. Citizens Research Coun.	Establish an office for business regulation to supersede present Corporations and Securities Commission, to supervise and coordinate following departments: insurance, public utilities, financial institutions, racing, athletic control.

MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION 111

No.	Subject	Principal Author	Major Recommendations
29	Aeronautics Dept.	Ralph Michener, Mich. Citizens Research Coun.	Replace the commission by a director appointed by the Governor and an advisory council. Abolish functions and Divisions of Education, Development, Airport Supervision, Aircraft Maintenance.
30	General Mgt. of State Government	Loren Miller, Mich. Citizens Research Coun.	Reorganize present 115 agencies into 40 agencies; 15 line departments under single directors; 13 appointive boards; 3 ex officio boards; 6 agencies under elective officers—Governor, Regents of University, Board of Agriculture (M.S.C.), secretary of state, treasurer, highway commissioner. (Citizens Committee favored appointment of last three.) Abolish State Administrative Board. Provide four-year terms for elective officers, with off-year elections. Empower Governor to submit reorganization plans, subject to legislative veto.

Interstate Cooperation

Increased cooperation among the states appears to offer great promise to meet both immediate and long-range needs for the effective promotion of mental health. Regional cooperation can become more than the sum of the actions of a number of individual states, for it permits each participating state to obtain maximum benefit from the total resources of the area rather than relying solely upon facilities within its geographical boundaries.

In the field of mental health, opportunities for regional cooperation hardly have been touched as yet. Topics that would seem to merit consideration in this connection include training of mental health personnel, research on mental disorder, a technical research exchange to provide information on current research, conferences on mental health problems, and the advisability of an interstate informational and consultative clearinghouse to aid the states in improving mental health programs.

—*Training and Research in State Mental Health Programs; A Report to the Governors' Conference* (The Council of State Governments, 1953), p. 207.

The Role of the Administrator in the Federal Government

By FREDERICK J. LAWTON

Commissioner, U. S. Civil Service Commission

WHEN I first came to consider what it was I was supposed to deal with in these remarks, several thoughts occurred to me, but none struck me as particularly elevating. For one thing, although many people have written on the administrator in the federal government with varying claims to authority, I had never been under any requirement or compulsion to set down my own views. Moreover, when I tried to inform myself by looking through some of these writings, I could not escape the conclusion that there is a surplus of theoretical treatment but a dearth of first-hand observation from the administrative workshops.

In the end I sought comfort in the assumption that perhaps the main reason for my being invited here was my record as a reluctant witness. Having been near the administrative workshops of the federal government for a considerable number of years, I might have become an expert on the behavior of administrators by sustained silence. As this kind of an expert, I owe it to myself to base my remarks primarily upon personal experience in watching administrators in the conduct of administrative business.

I

IF I were a purist in semantics, I could begin with the paradoxical assertion that there is no such thing as administrators in the federal government. This would permit me to wind up the subject right now by saying that it does not exist, except in the imagination of theorists.

NOTE: This paper was read to the Junior Management Development Group, Atomic Energy Commission, July 17, 1953.

As a matter of fact, the designation "administrator" is rarely used in governmental nomenclature. In addition, not a few of those who have carried the title "administrator" in the recent past have spent much of their time on matters other than what most would call administration. What is equally striking is that sometimes these formally designated administrators have neither been picked for previous demonstration of administrative talent nor have they left a monument of notable administrative accomplishment.

Despite such reasons for caution, one often hears, especially in academic quarters, that what the federal government needs most is a corps of trained administrators. When pressed for elaboration, those advancing this demand usually describe the trained administrators as a race of divinely favored beings who are not only crackerjacks in running governmental departments but also marvels of vision, devotion, and probity. The customary corollary of specifications as exacting as these is the insistence that administrators, in order to dedicate themselves to their noble tasks, ought to be left in peace by the politicians. It is argued that politics, in the ordinary American sense, should not be allowed to encroach upon the serene atmosphere in which administrators can best carry on the job of administration. Needless to say, all of this is sharply disputed by the school of thought which stresses the essential unity of the political and the administrative processes under representative government.

It is thus evident that widely conflicting views are current about what governmental administrators are and what their contribution to the success of a good society might be. My own position can be stated simply. I am quite

ready without much ado to brush aside the myth that public administration can live a sheltered life, separated by barbed wire from the pressures and clamors of politics.

To be more specific, I consider it unnecessary in the light of all evidence to show that public administration is never exclusively administrative. Administrative officials, especially on the top level, of necessity must shoulder responsibilities of a political character. The whole idea of a race of divinely favored beings at the helm of governmental departments is in conflict with the realities of the American system of government. The concept of a corps of trained administrators left to their own resources would not accomplish what it appears to promise, because public administration does not operate in a political void.

It follows that when I talk of administrators I think neither of a managerial class nor of a breed of men who excel at administration. Rather, I have in mind the heads of governmental agencies, whether they would regard themselves primarily as policy-makers or as administrators. There are, of course, great differences between the highest officer of one of the large executive departments and the head of a small agency. The small agency may survive in nominal independence merely because it has not yet been put under the wings of a department that could logically serve as its foster parent. In spite of such differences, however, heads of agencies—whether large or small—face many common problems in the exercise of their responsibilities.

Although I have probably sounded less than gracious in my previous allusions to administrative theory, I propose to make amends by offering some theory myself. That theory, however, is not mine. I take it directly from the Constitution.

True enough, for the most part the Founding Fathers reduced the text of the Constitution to the bare bones of practical requirements to provide a government that would work satisfactorily. But the majority of those who in the hot summer of 1787 sweated through the Constitutional Convention possessed remarkably astute theories about the strength needed in the executive branch. The fear was very real that a strong President might soon turn into another George III. Despite this

fear, however, the makers of the Constitution provided for a unified executive centered upon the vast responsibility of a single man—the President.

The constitutional concept subordinates each administrator to the chief executive. Thus, even the most exalted view of the administrator in the federal government always remains overshadowed by the plain fact of the President's executive supremacy. In the view of the Constitution, then, Cabinet members as well as lesser officials in charge of agencies are never the final judges of how far the interest drives within their departments ought to be subordinated to the public interest. The President's judgment has overriding authority.

Nor does the Constitution give recognition to the weight of clienteles and pressure groups. It does not recognize the right of administrators to capitulate to special interests, because the general course of policy to be pursued must be the President's. In the constitutional perspective, all administrators, high and low, are the President's subordinates. Yet they are not meant to stay aloof from the way the President makes up his mind. The Constitution says explicitly that department heads have a responsibility to furnish counsel to the President.

The Constitution in still other ways defines the role of the administrator in the federal government by enforcing certain standards of compatibility. In the first place, it is by his own choice that the President determines the membership of his official family. This may be a matter of agreement in political point of view. It may also be a matter of personal predilection. Yet the President is not wholly free to choose. When nominating administrators, he is compelled to consider additional criteria because of the Senate's right to confirm nominations and the constitutional usage known as senatorial courtesy.

For the composite picture of the administrator in the federal government, the requirement of Senate confirmation is very important. It is well to recall that there is little chance of service for men or women who have substantially more vigor than tact; who have a passion for unpopular causes; who in some other way rub against the grain of elected representatives; or who show inflexibility in coping with the dynamic forces of political life. In the choice of

administrators, then, the Constitution insists upon a combination of factors that tend to insure both acceptability to the President and acceptability to the Senate. It is the need for meeting these two sets of standards that often throws administrators later upon resources of political support which collide with the preferences of the President.

Despite this serious ambiguity in the political context, it is not difficult to draw the principal inferences from the constitutional concept. There is a strong hint that administrators should work for the President. This, in turn, carries with it the implication that administrators must act in the perspective of the President. Obviously, in order to be able so to act, they must take the initiative in finding out what lies in the President's perspective. It is no less obvious that administrators, from the angle of the Constitution, must be prepared to accept the President's authority. They must be able in this respect to control their mental reservations.

Above all, administrators are assumed by the Constitution to operate as the President's team. It is good to know that the idea of executive teamwork is as old as the Republic. As a final inference of the constitutional concept, in order to function as agents of a single responsible chief executive, administrators necessarily must be close to the President—intellectually and emotionally, physically and personally. In the day of "big government," institutional distance tends to keep the President apart from the heads of the governmental agencies. The greater this distance becomes in individual cases, the more does fiction replace the fact of the President's team.

The Constitution gives the President effective disciplinary sanctions against an administrator who departs from the constitutional theory. There is the power of dismissal, left almost fully to the President's discretion by the Supreme Court. There is the unquestioned power of the President to direct the executive establishment. There is, finally, a clear indication of the President's controlling role in conveying the position of the executive branch to Congress.

To sum up, if we judge by the theory embedded in the Constitution, administrators—as executives serving under the President—

should have personal capacity for rendering this kind of personal service. Not even outstanding competence gives an administrator the right to ignore or overshadow the President. As advisers to the President, administrators cannot be expected to perform well except when they give him first loyalty. Last, no administrator can regard himself as privileged to "take a walk" when he feels like it. He is supposed to stand by the President as long as he holds his appointment.

II

VIEWED against the theory embodied in the Constitution, the contrast presented by the political reality in which administrators do their work is very striking. But we should not be misled by the contrast. Above all, its existence does not allow us to conclude that hard facts have rendered null and void the theory of the Constitution.

Impressed with the proverbial gulf between theory and practice, many underestimate the value of theory as a maker of practice. Widely accepted theory is a formative influence of great importance. This is appreciated more readily when one considers what the harsh grip of political reality might have done to the administrative structure of the federal government if that structure could not lean heavily on the theory as well as the letter of the Constitution.

What are the basic elements of the political reality which we have to bear in mind when we examine the role of the administrator?

Taken together, the basic elements of the administrator's political environment cover a good deal of ground. There is first the separation of powers, which we can better evaluate in its effects when we recall that it is a principle more radically applied in our country than anywhere else. Ours is the political system that has the dubious distinction of being most uncompromising in checking one branch of government by another. This is most obvious in the relationship between the legislative and the executive branches, which confront each other as coequals.

Although there is a certain interlacing of functions between these two branches, especially in the powers of the Senate, the Constitu-

tution does not supply any specific devices to guarantee the necessary measure of institutional cooperation. The recurrent instances of friction between the President and Congress are thus made almost inevitable. In fact, one must regard them as necessary in order to test public issues and to give both the President and the Congress free play in shifting the initiative.

As I see it, the stress and strain resulting from the separation of powers have increased with time because of the marked rise of the executive branch in public importance. It is not my contention that the job of governmental executives has never entailed more than deferential execution of public policy defined on a higher level. But it is plain, I think, that the era of the modern "service state" has brought with it the need for administrative machinery of such scope that control over it is a matter of prime political concern.

In the growth of administrative machinery, the professionalization of public service is a conspicuous characteristic. Thus the executive branch has become a source of vital administrative knowledge which cannot be ignored in the making of public policy. With public policy often made in the decisions of administrators, such decisions are naturally an object of keen congressional interest. Administrators cannot extricate themselves from this interest.

Both the separation of powers and the growing stature of the executive branch expose administrators to the undercurrents of legislative-executive antagonism. The consequences could be mitigated by a party system that would furnish a sufficiently strong link between the legislative and the executive branches. Under such a party system, a general program of governmental action could be jointly developed and executed as part of a joint plan. But talk about this kind of program is still idle speculation, because we do not now possess political parties of sufficient cohesiveness to function as national coordinators of interests.

The traditional commitments made in party programs are too often purely oratorical. There is not enough strength behind them to produce a well-defined working relationship between the legislative and the executive branches. Majority decisions in Congress usually do not run along party lines. The familiar independence

of individual members or particular factions in the legislature makes it hard for administrators to gain a foundation for departmental programs in the halls of Congress. In each instance, support has to be rallied by complicated maneuvers.

Lack of strength of party control on the national level almost automatically shifts the center of political gravity in the direction of pressure politics. I do not deny that the operation of pressure groups supplies a rudimentary degree of interest representation. But it must be remembered that this representation is accomplished outside the channels of party responsibility, and thus works beyond any effective accounting to the voter at large.

A party intent upon governing would find itself in need of a general plan of action. Special interests, in their very nature, are hostile to the discipline of general commitments based upon a full-scale program. It would be superfluous to demonstrate that legislative response to the pressures of special interests is often at the expense of longer-range policy. In the rapidly changing scrimmages of pressure politics, administrators find it extremely difficult to give consistent expression to the concept of a unified executive branch.

The cumulative effect of all of this is sharply differing legislative and executive perspectives. There is, of course, always a difference of point of view between the lawmaker and the executive. But the difference is greatly magnified when the legislative and the executive branches pull apart. It is multiplied further when the election system bolsters traditions of regionalism and localism which affect one branch strongly and the other much less.

For all practical purposes, Congress makes its chief contribution to American life by giving political self-expression to a diversified society. This society is diversified in terms both of interest and of locality. By contrast, the President, during this century, has become more and more the mouthpiece of nationwide concerns. These concerns tend to be urban, industrial, national, or international.

Frequent clashes between Congress and the President are therefore a natural condition of the American system of government in our economic era. This we need not bemoan. Apart from some shadow boxing, conflict between

the two branches signifies that each is making its distinctive contribution to the kind of society that may best be able to sustain a highly productive economic order and at the same time to defend the freedom of the common man. It is a wholly different matter, however, to judge the outcome of such battles from the angle of the individual administrator. He may often regard himself wearily as the football of politics.

In sum, the emphasis on institutional unity and broadly conceived responsibility that runs through the Constitution is considerably reduced by the realities of politics. Both within Congress and within the executive branch, there is noticeable weakness of internal control. This shows itself in the relationship between Congress and its highly autonomous committees. It also shows itself in the degree to which strong political figures may dominate particular parts of the legislative scene.

Weakness of internal control shows itself, on the other side, in the relationship between the President and his principal subordinates at the helm of the governmental agencies. This fact is no less evident in the relationship between department heads and their own subordinates. A department head may find it safer for himself or politically more profitable for his agency to reflect the wishes of a congressional committee than to comply with the policy of the President. A bureau chief with strong ties to a particular clientele or its legislative counterpart may feel free to shrug off commands from above with impunity.

This should make it easy to understand why administrators by no means always want to go along with the President. It explains why in many instances their course of action reflects the strength of special interests. It also suggests the reason why administrators are not easily disciplined by the President.

There is thus no mystery in the fact that administrators will often be chosen for characteristics other than executive competence. Nor is it surprising that administrators are sometimes the products of narrowly defined interests. In other words, no President can afford to overlook the fact that there will always be among his department heads political transients who have their eyes firmly fixed on goals other than to work for him.

It is the presence in varying strength of all of these factors that shapes the political reality which surrounds the administrator. In view of the contrast with the theory of the Constitution, it may seem surprising that most department heads come through with a pretty convincing performance. Many of them somehow manage to live up to their basic duties. Nearly all concern themselves deeply with the job before them.

III

BUT what is their job? Is it to make sure that young Emily, presenting herself with highly persuasive political credentials to crash the gate as a typist, will actually get a place in the department? Is it to fish a key staff member from a congressional committee for a strategic spot in the agency so that thereafter the agency may hope for friendlier treatment from the committee? Is it to build up the administrator's personal prestige as a past master of management? Is it to make sure that employees faithfully observe office hours and do not dawdle away Uncle Sam's precious time over a cup of coffee? It is not unlikely that each of these matters has occupied an abnormal share of an administrator's time upon occasion. Much depends on personality and circumstance.

Perhaps the job of the administrator is all of these things together and some more. Perhaps the job consists more often of a great number of rather small things than of a few mountain-moving accomplishments of the kind that happen once in a long while. An administrator who is good only at the big things may not stay long in the federal government.

In part, the administrator's job is a subjective thing, of course. No one, for instance, would want to minimize the temptation for men in power to think first of rewards that would accrue to themselves. But there is also an objective side. It should not be forgotten that the administrator's job is firmly joined to the mandate of his department. That mandate is spelled out in law.

Thus, when entering upon his duties, each administrator usually finds a fairly well-defined pattern of going departmental concerns. Many of these concerns are based directly upon

statutory requirements. They may change but little during the tenure of the agency head.

Some of the going concerns will flourish or wilt because of changes in budgetary support. In addition, certain programs, although of strong appeal to the heart of the administrator, may be peculiarly vulnerable to political controversy as well as to drives for economy. Only in relatively few instances will an administrator enjoy the satisfaction of getting under way new programs of his own making. Still rarer is the chance for him to redirect the resources of his department as a whole toward new goals.

However large the margin of creative effort, most administrators find it far from easy to visualize their departmental programs as part of the governmentwide program. Yet this is probably the critically important part of the role of the administrator in the federal government. As a minimum, he must be able to sense his agency's relationships not only with the President but also with other agencies.

I do not stop here. To me, the team idea in administration stands or falls with the resolution shown by administrators in keeping their agencies at the assigned places in the governmental front. This is the true test of public service on the level of administrative leadership. It requires breadth of thinking as well as of planning.

The test becomes eminently practical in those administrative concerns which span across the entire executive branch, whether in terms of policy or of management. One good example is the budget process. In the administration of the budget, both in its preparation and in its execution, administrators are furnished a standing invitation to reexamine not only the balance of operations within their agencies but also the part played by their agencies in the work of the government as a whole. The central insurance of effective standards for personnel management is another example of governmentwide concerns.

Without denying that my personal experience has built up in me some bias, I do believe that there is still a shortage of administrators who lead their agencies toward the common public interest. Too few of them appreciate in the work of central staff agencies the need for coordination and coherence across the entire executive branch. I hasten to admit that cen-

tral staff agencies, in turn, do not always demonstrate sufficient insight into the struggles administrators must carry on in order to accomplish the missions of their agencies.

Perhaps it should be added that there is sometimes value in the experience of a department and a central staff agency confronting each other with crossed swords. Each may be engaged in fostering an interest of real merit. But it is also obvious that a reconciliation of positions is necessary for the good both of the government and of the public.

Reconciliation, however, can mean different things. In working toward such a reconciliation, it would be disastrous if narrow departmental concerns always gained the upper hand. The pressure exerted by central staff agencies toward sufficiently broadly conceived solutions is a vitally important pressure. This pressure can be relaxed only when administrators direct their agencies to correlate departmental objectives with the broader concept of the public interest.

Looking at the administrator's role from within, one would like to see the head of an agency, even if it is small, as a leader of men rather than as a revolving band of written orders. In order to keep his mind free for large matters and fresh enough to show an inventive turn in dealing with them, he should push down to lower levels responsibility for final action where in the nature of things such responsibility can best be assumed. He should train his eyes to see the whole behind the parts. And he should ask for a frequent accounting for administrative performance so that the results of departmental action are not only put on record but are also tested for effectiveness with reasonable detachment.

When I suggest that it is desirable for him to provide himself with periodic accounting for his agency's administrative performance, I do not mean to make the administrator into a hypochondriac. There are many things in the workings of his department which even the most conscientious administrator will have to take for granted. He simply cannot attempt to have everything double-checked.

He should know, therefore, that there remain always many points of attack from the outside, despite the greatest care in supervision. In meeting such attacks, he would do well to

assume that he will have a legitimate defense. He should not get scared easily.

It has often been remarked that governmental executives live in a goldfish bowl. By comparison with private executives, they need much patience with the persistent flock of kibitzers all around them. They must learn to live with criticism for they cannot get rid of it.

It is true, of course, that political kibitzers fulfill a very necessary task in a free society like ours. Administrators should persuade themselves that even in the most merciless heckler there is part of the wakefulness of an alert citizenry. Public criticism must not only be taken with good grace, but should even be welcomed as a desirable therapy.

In their relations with members or committees of Congress, administrators frequently show an excessive defensiveness. This is understandable because of the difficulty for them to find a place to which they can successfully appeal from even ill-advised congressional action. In my opinion, however, undue submissiveness does not pay. On the contrary, it actually encourages exploitation.

More effective in winning support from the legislative side is the administrator's determination to insist upon straight dealing in all contacts between his department and the legislative body, on the lower levels as well as on his own. Not unnaturally, congressmen take offense at overbearing behavior or demonstrative self-righteousness. Many of them, however, do not mind giving a helping hand to a bungling administrator who mars his case before them by clumsy handling, and yet is able to win sympathy by honesty and humor.

Even if an administrator should be the beneficiary of such sympathy, he must not deceive himself about the danger of having too many good friends. He had better make sure to keep the reins of his department in his own hands. Too many good friends on an important committee of Congress may prove a liability rather than an asset for an administrator who wants to stay at the top of his department.

No less complex are the administrator's relations with the interest groups closest to his agency. I suppose that books could be written about the strategy of marshaling clientele support. Suffice it to point out the predicament in which an administrator might put himself if

he comes to feel that the particular interest groups nearest to his agency are identical with the general public. It is essential for him to realize that a department's public is always only one among various publics.

Administrators, above all, must guard against the error of assuming that the positions taken by the spokesmen or headquarters of particular interest groups always express the general preferences of the membership. One of the best ways of easing the pressure from those who speak for interest organizations is for the administrator to sound out the feelings of the body of members. Interest representation can easily turn into pretense.

As a public figure, the administrator is inevitably up to his ears in public relations. This is true whether or not he is conscious of it. It is true even if he assiduously withdraws his personality from the public limelight. One cannot be in charge of important public business without coming to watch the public with the sensitivity of a jealous spouse.

There has grown up in recent decades a good deal of machinery in governmental departments to deal with public relations in an organized way. I am inclined to think that in this field we are still far from a settled state. For one thing, it should inspire caution that Congress has repeatedly revealed its strong mental reservations toward a high-pressure handling of public relations. Perhaps the feeling prevails that public information and propaganda are not easily separated. Perhaps a suspicion exists that departments which sun themselves in public approval get too big for legislative control.

Whatever the explanation, it seems to me that today the administrator is safest when he is his own principal public relations man. He becomes politically vulnerable when there is too much planned publicity about him. He must personally play the central role in articulating and interpreting the mandate of his agency in the forum of public opinion. If he fails in this respect, he will have failed in a large part of his job.

Let me leave you with this thought. Do not attempt too precise a definition of the role of the administrator. Rather fix in your minds the general concepts and apply them with discretion to particular organizations or circumstances.

United States Representation at International Organizations, Geneva

By DONALD C. BLAISDELL

*Visiting Professor of International Relations
University of Florida*

IN 1952 the Department of State established a United States Resident Delegation to International Organizations at Geneva, Switzerland. Previously, official contacts with the United Nations Regional Office for Europe and with the several United Nations specialized agencies had been maintained through separate officials. In establishing a Resident Delegation, the United States took a step which had already been taken by twenty-one other members of the United Nations and by five nonmembers.¹

I

GENEVA is unique among cities providing seats for international organizations. It is the headquarters of a larger number of United Nations specialized agencies than any other city in the world. Also, with the exception of Montreal, which is the headquarters for the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), it is the only city with specialized agency headquarters which is not a national capital. Moreover, Geneva is unique in accommodating the European office of the United Nations, the only regional office established by the United Nations, and the secretariats of four specialized agencies. In addition, eighty-seven other international organizations (intergovernmental, private, etc.) have headquarters or offices in Geneva.²

¹ The members were Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Greece, Iran, Jugoslavia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and Venezuela. Nonmembers were: Austria, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Spain.

² *Yearbook of International Organizations, 1951-52* ed. (Brussels: The Union of International Associations), p. 1155.

First representation of the United States on a permanent basis at intergovernmental organizations at Geneva goes back to 1934.³ When the United States by congressional resolution in that year became a member of the International Labor Organization (ILO) an observer for ILO affairs was sent to Geneva and was maintained there by the State and Labor Departments. This representation was interrupted in 1939 when the outbreak of war caused the ILO to move its headquarters to Montreal.

After the war the scope of United States representation at Geneva was broadened and developed rapidly. The United States took the lead in establishing the United Nations and the specialized agencies and in retaining much of the organized, intergovernmental activity started during the war in the field of European economics. When the ILO returned to Geneva, permanent contact was reestablished. With the transfer of the headquarters of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) from Bern to Geneva an attaché for telecommunications matters was assigned there. Representation to the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) began in 1947, when that regional com-

³ As early as 1928 relations between the United States and the League of Nations and the International Labor Office were such as to justify additional staff in the American consulate at Geneva. In 1928 the consulate was enlarged and reorganized, only one of the five members being assigned to consular work. In 1930, when Prentiss Gilbert was sent to Geneva as consul in charge, the State Department announcement stated that the consulate would be used for carrying on relations with the League and the ILO. (Clarence A. Berdahl, *The Policy of the U.S. with respect to the League of Nations* (Geneva: Librairie Kundig, 1932)).

mission of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) was established on United States initiative. Heavy financial support by the United States of the repatriation and resettlement of refugees by the International Refugee Organization (IRO) made it wise for the United States to have someone permanently on the ground when IRO was set up in 1947. In the same year the World Health Organization (WHO) decided on Geneva for its headquarters. Although the Department of State and the United States Public Health Service discussed sending a public health officer to Geneva for constant liaison with WHO, this arrangement never materialized. Liaison with WHO was one of the duties of the representative for specialized agency affairs when his office was added in 1949. Two years later multilateral activities in meteorology were added to those relating to labor, refugees, health, and telecommunications. Thereupon the United States Weather Bureau sent an officer to represent United States interests and to assist the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in moving its headquarters from Lausanne and in getting them established in Geneva. Delegations were arriving from Washington with increasing frequency and were spending weeks at conferences of these agencies. To provide these delegations with conference services the Department of State decided to set up and maintain at Geneva a conference attaché.

Thus, within a few years six separate representatives had been established in Geneva in addition to a consulate. Each had the necessary secretarial staff; the representative to ECE had a professional staff as well. Each provided part of his administrative services but was dependent on the consulate for the rest. Each was independent of the others, an autonomy which was guarded and strengthened by different departments and agencies in Washington which were responsible for instructions and "back-stopping." The contraction of the staff of the ECE delegation between 1950 and 1952 was offset in part by the addition of the meteorological attaché and an attaché for escapee affairs.

About the same time the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) chose Geneva as its temporary headquarters. Although no proposal for permanent, separate

United States representation to ICEM has yet been broached, there is little doubt that both the United States government and the committee are interested in permanent contact in Geneva. This intergovernmental agency was established in late 1951 to take over the fleet of ships formerly operated by IRO. The United States makes by far the largest contribution to both its administrative and its operating budgets.

Since 1945 the executive branch of the United States government has felt the need for officials permanently assigned to intergovernmental organizations at Geneva for purposes of representation, negotiation, liaison, reporting, coordination of policy, and servicing of delegations. The United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the temporary or nonpermanent intergovernmental committees in Geneva are public international organizations. While they were being set up and put in operation many organizational problems arose—administrative, budgetary, personnel, and fiscal. The United States is expected to have uniform and consistent views on such problems in relation to all the international organizations to which it belongs. Attaining that consistency is a matter of coordination of the views of the various agencies, departments, and parts of departments in Washington. Equally important is the presentation of United States views to the representative and executive organs and to the secretariats of the agencies. Such presentation is a principal reason for maintaining permanent representation at Geneva. It is of interest to many parts of the executive branch in Washington—the State and Labor Departments, the Public Health Service, the Federal Communications Commission, the Mutual Security Agency, and more recently the Foreign Operations Administration. It is of interest, too, to private economic and social interests and to other nongovernmental organizations in consultative status with ECOSOC.

As agent of the Department of State in the presentation of coordinated policy in Geneva, the Resident Delegation is one of several such agencies advocating such policies at various intergovernmental organizations. The Resident Delegation also gathers information from the directors of the specialized agencies and their secretariats and from voluntary agencies and

nongovernmental organizations with world or regional headquarters in Geneva. Significant opinion is also collected from private citizens and from governments similarly represented. All this information and opinion is transmitted by telegraph, telephone, or dispatch to the Department of State. There it is received, routed to interested agencies, and consolidated with information received from missions to world capitals, from the United States mission to the United Nations headquarters in New York, and from permanent representatives to other international organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Rome, the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Paris, ICAO in Montreal, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund in Washington. Information thus gathered is used as the raw material from which new policy is made and old policy adapted or abandoned.

The Resident Delegation also maintains liaison with the ILO, WHO, ITU, WMO, ICEM, and the UN Regional Office for Europe. When instructed to do so, it represents or assists in representing the United States in regular or special sessions of the various bodies of these organizations. Servicing of United States delegations includes accrediting them to the organizations concerned and performing various administrative duties, mostly internal. The Resident Delegation may also assist delegations to conferences in other parts of Europe.

II

How was the Resident Delegation at Geneva organized to carry out its various duties? For a number of reasons this was a difficult problem to solve, and the organization scheme agreed to and put into effect in 1952 has not met all the difficulties. Most of them can be traced to reluctance to accept the organizational consequences of consular and international organization representation at Geneva, and to the different privileges and immunities for the two sets of officers assigned to these two types of representation.

Behind the reluctance to accept the effects of dual representation lies the strength of tradition. Representation of the interests of one

state by consuls in the territory of another is very old. Consular duties are well defined. They include official relations with local authorities and matters involving individual nationals—citizenship, visas, passports, welfare and estate matters, and consular invoices. Such representation differs in scope and focus from the representation of the interests of the same state at an international organization located on the territory of the second. The duties of such representation grow out of membership in multilateral international organizations; they include multilateral negotiation and accommodation, reporting from international secretariats, liaison with international officials, and presentation of official views to them.

Since World War II the issue of bilateral versus multilateral foreign policy has agitated officials in Washington. Congress and the country have joined in debating it. The issue has been complicated by the notion, widely held, that in signing the United Nations Charter the United States limited, if it did not surrender entirely, its freedom to conduct foreign relations on a bilateral, country-by-country basis. This is a false view, of course, but it has persisted to plague our policy formulators, both in Congress and in the executive branch.

Management specialists trying to devise an organization chart for Geneva could hardly be expected to escape this problem if their fellow officers in the "substantive" fields continued to argue its merits and demerits. The question of the organization of the personnel at the small foreign service post at Geneva therefore became involved in the arguments over multilateralism versus bilateralism. Officers charged with making policy recommendations for international organizations stressed the value of giving field personnel separate organizational identity. Other officers belittled the functional differentiation between consular (bilateral) operations and intergovernmental organization (multilateral) activities.

Differences in the local status of United States officials also raised difficulties. Members of permanent delegations to international organizations enjoy privileges and immunities greater than those enjoyed by other officials of their governments in Geneva. A decree of the Swiss Federal Council of April, 1948, gave to delegates and officials of member governments

of the specialized agencies with seats in Switzerland the same privileges and immunities as are granted to officers of corresponding rank in the diplomatic missions in Bern. Members of the American Resident Delegation thus enjoyed the same position as their "opposite numbers" in permanent delegations maintained at Geneva. The position of American consular officials, however, was regulated by consular convention which gives fewer privileges and less immunity from control by local authorities.

As a consequence there were numerous minor points of potential friction between delegation and consular personnel. One such point involved contacts with local police and customs officials when receiving visiting Americans arriving in Geneva as members of delegations. Another point was division of responsibility for official entertainment of delegations of other governments. Free import privileges accorded Resident Delegation members but not consular staff was still another. Whether consular staff assigned locally to the Resident Delegation should be carried on the local diplomatic list and be privileged to carry the CD (*corps diplomatique*) on their motor vehicles were troublesome details.

More important were the organizational and protocol factors involved in deciding on the headship of the Resident Delegation. Should the delegation be headed by the chief of the diplomatic mission in Bern? By a chief in Geneva, independent of the Bern mission chief? By the principal consular officer? Does the maintenance of relations with the international agencies call for a resident delegation chief and, if so, what should the organizational relationships be with the chief of the diplomatic mission in Bern and the principal consular officer in Geneva? The prevailing view has been that there could be but one chief of United States mission in any country and that all official personnel in that country, no matter what Washington department or agency they represented, should report to him. For obvious reasons this question does not arise in connection with the United States Mission to the United Nations at its New York headquarters, but it does arise wherever the United States maintains permanent representatives both to the local sovereign and to intergovernmental organizations such as those at Geneva.

These questions, by no means all, illustrate the difficulties faced by the Department of State in organizing American representation at Geneva. They are not of outstanding importance when compared with many problems confronting the department in Washington, but neither can they be ignored or dismissed as of little consequence. Upon satisfactory answers depends in a way the standing of the United States not only in Geneva and with the Swiss people but also with the twenty-six other governments which maintain permanent missions to the Geneva organizations.

The action by the Department of State in 1952 established a single United States Resident Delegation to International Organizations at Geneva. The following officers and staffs previously enjoying operational autonomy were made parts of the Resident Delegation: the delegation to ECE, the telecommunications attaché, the meteorological attaché, the economic officer (labor), and the representative for specialized agency affairs. When named in 1952, the attaché for escapee affairs was also made part of the Resident Delegation. Also included was the conference attaché and staff, previously under the supervision of the consul general.

The chief of the United States diplomatic mission in Bern, the United States Minister, was named chief of the Resident Delegation. An office of deputy chief was established in Geneva; the deputy chief was also the representative for international organization affairs. He had the primary responsibility for conducting United States relations with international organizations with headquarters in Geneva. He was also given responsibility for coordinating budgetary, personnel, and other administrative aspects of the work of the United States in the specialized agencies and in ICEM. He supervised the work of the economic officer (labor) and, under instructions from Washington, maintained the necessary contact with WHO on technical public health matters. The conference attaché's office and staff were placed under his supervision. The specialized attachés for meteorology and telecommunications retained freedom from local supervision, however, in policy and operational affairs in their fields.

The quarters of the Resident Delegation

are maintained at the Hôtel du Rhône, the Statler-like edifice constructed and operated with American tastes and service requirements in mind. Under a five-year lease, entered into in 1950, the delegation occupies the fifth floor and supervises the use of the fourth floor which, with its conference room and offices, is maintained for the United States delegations in Geneva for sessions of United Nations organs and specialized agencies and other international organizations. Numerous members of Congress who have participated in such sessions as members of delegations as well as many employees of the Department of State and other federal agencies are familiar with these modern headquarters. These offices are no doubt superior in many ways to those previously occupied by the consulate on the Rue du Mont Blanc and by the predecessor delegations to ECE in the premises of the Parc Ariana, formerly the site of the League of Nations headquarters, now the United Nations Regional Office for Europe. Whether the decision in 1950 to move to consolidated quarters in the Hôtel du Rhône was wise is another matter. The American resident delegations were thus deprived of day-to-day contacts with their counterparts from other governments, a handicap to liaison which has not yet been overcome.

As set up in 1952 the Resident Delegation had no administrative section, and administrative services are provided by the consul general. The delegation does not arrange for or supervise its space requirements, communications and local transportation facilities, accounting and disbursement activities, security of premises, or office supplies. Office equipment, however, is under the control of the delegation through control by the conference attaché of funds allotted for this purpose from the International Contingencies item of the State Department Appropriation Act. The hiring of personnel locally for temporary delegation needs is also in the hands of the conference attaché.

As in administrative matters, the delegation is not a self-contained organization in the financing of salaries and allowances. Different members of the delegation are paid from different appropriations. The deputy chief, the economic officer (labor), and the conference and deputy conference attachés are paid from

the Missions to International Organizations item of the State Department Appropriation Act. The adviser to the representative to the ECE was also paid from this item for a time. From this item are also paid the salaries and allowances of four Americans in the administrative section of the Consulate General and the salaries of four local employees. The telecommunications attaché, however, and his secretary are paid from the Salaries and Expenses item of the State Department Appropriation Act, as are most American members of the Consulate General. The meteorological attaché and secretary are paid by the Weather Bureau. Salaries and allowances of the escapee attaché and secretary come from Foreign Operations Administration (formerly Mutual Security Agency) appropriations. The salary of one locally-recruited chauffeur is charged to the Missions item. Maintenance and repair of motor vehicles and rent, heat, light, and telephone are prorated between the two State Departments items—Missions and Salaries and Expenses. Premises are secured by Marine Corps guards assigned by the Legation in Bern.

III

How effective has the Resident Delegation been since its organization in 1952? Despite organizational anomalies the members of the delegation have worked together effectively. In a real sense the delegation is a mission to the international organizations in Geneva. All of the officials of these organizations recognize it as their point of contact on the United States parts of their respective programs. In its relations with the Consulate General and with Washington the delegation has combined proper proportions of organizational correctness and administrative flexibility.

Interests of the United States in the United Nations program, worldwide and regional, centered in Geneva are better advanced by a single Resident Delegation than by a loose collection of specialized delegations. In representing the views of the United States nothing is lost and much is gained in having the headship of the United States representation to Geneva organizations clearly defined. Washington knows whom to instruct and whom to hold accountable for carrying out instructions.

Centralization of responsibility has been achieved without sacrificing the advantages of functional specialization. Policies and positions on matters of "across the board" import, such as personnel practices, assessments against the United States, agency budgets, technical assistance matters, and session sites, are clearly under the coordinating supervision of the delegation head, as is dealing with the recurring problem of which government, Nationalist or Communist, shall be accepted for purposes of representing China. Manpower and industrial committee problems, European migration and escapee interests with voluntary agencies, radio frequencies, synoptic meteorological matters, and visiting delegation affairs fall as clearly within the province of the respective specialized attachés. Thus, differentiated functional responsibility and over-all coordinating responsibility are both attained.

Under recognized leadership the cohesion of the delegation has been improved. Related action has replaced independent action and knowledge of the programs of colleagues has replaced ignorance of them. Morale and cohesion are both advanced by delegation staff meetings held at suitable intervals. Thus, in the low voltage political atmosphere of Geneva a Resident Delegation can develop a collective sense of support for the socio-economic programs of the United Nations system more effectively than can a group of representatives with uncoordinated responsibilities.

It has been advantageous for the heads of the specialized and other international agencies in Geneva and the director of the United Nations European Office to be able to deal with a representative for international organization affairs on matters common to all agencies and with technical attachés on matters of interest to their respective agencies. No government has preached the values of coordination in the United Nations more loudly than has the United States. Nor has any, according to a highly-placed Geneva official, honored them more in the breach. Administratively, a co-ordinated operation under the supervision of a recognized head is better than a group of separate, uncoordinated operations. The tightening-up of 1952 did not occur because of the criticism just noted, but it did strengthen the members of the Resident Delegation in their

dealings with secretariat officials. These officials, on the other hand, seemed to regard the tightening-up as a step in the direction of facilitating their contacts with United States officials accredited to international agencies.

It is believed that the organizational relationships between the Resident Delegation and the Consulate General have improved. No doubt organizational anomalies still exist. They are inherent in the Geneva situation, as they are in any situation where the United States carries on business with national authorities and with officials of multilateral organizations. To a limited extent they resemble the situation in Rome where United States diplomatic and consular authorities carry on relations with Italian authorities and an American attaché has liaison and other duties *vis-à-vis* the Food and Agricultural Organization. A similar situation is found in Paris with respect to UNESCO. An example on a large scale is the American Embassy in Paris which carries on diplomatic and consular business with French authorities, while the Office of the Special Representative deals with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation as the collectivity of its member governments. A closer parallel to Geneva, both qualitatively and quantitatively, is found in Montreal, where an American Consulate General maintains relations with Canadian authorities and a permanent American delegation represents the United States at ICAO.

Thus the problem of organization in Geneva is not unique but is found wherever the United States maintains simultaneously on a permanent basis representation both for the newer form of multilateral governmental cooperation and for the traditional form of bilateral, government-to-government, cooperation. It will confront the Department of State as long as United States interests require cooperation with other nations on both a multilateral and a bilateral basis. If United States foreign relations are now passing through an intermediate phase from bilateralism to advanced multilateralism, the problem of organizing satisfactorily the relations between the Geneva Consulate General and Resident Delegation may be recognized as a small organizational aspect of that transition.

Working Overseas for the United States Government

By MILTON M. MANDELL

U. S. Civil Service Commission

THE problems connected with the need for having government employment overseas have been the subject of numerous studies during the past five years. The legislative and executive branches of the government, as well as private research groups, have recognized the relationship of these problems to the new role of the United States in world affairs. Since attitudes and morale are related to effective administration, it is worth while to obtain evidence on these factors in regard to overseas employees.

The data in this article are based on the answers to a written questionnaire of 1,059 overseas civilian employees of the federal government. This group was made up of approximately equal numbers of employees from each of the five major overseas agencies of the government: the Department of State, the Mutual Security Agency (now Foreign Operations Administration), the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The information was collected, as part of a larger study, in the summer of 1952 in group sessions conducted by teams from Washington. The sample included employees in the following locations: Paris, 177; Vienna, 79; Salzburg, 82; Wiesbaden, 87; Manila, 107; Okinawa, 172; Guam, 139; Alaska, 52; Japan, 121; and Korea, 43. Although the representation from major capital cities was heavy, places with limited facilities, such as Okinawa, Guam, and Alaska (Kodiak), were included.

It may be helpful to the interpretation of the data to know that 64 per cent of the persons in the sample had been overseas continuously more than 3 years; 25 per cent had been overseas continuously from 1 to 3 years; and the remaining 11 per cent had been overseas less than 1 year.

1. Why did these people go overseas? Of the group, 17 per cent said they went because they felt the program of their agency was of great importance; 34 per cent, because it seemed to provide a good opportunity to gain experience or to do work they liked; 18 per cent, because they wanted to travel; and 12 per cent, because they thought the assignment was a good financial opportunity. The remaining 19 per cent offered a variety of reasons or did not answer this question.

Why was the overseas assignment attractive to the wives of married employees? In answer, 32 per cent said it was an opportunity to save money; 9 per cent offered prestige as the motivation; 18 per cent said the novelty and excitement were the major motivations; 17 per cent said it was an opportunity to serve their country; 14 per cent said it provided an opportunity for advancement; and 10 per cent did not specify.

2. How satisfied were these employees now that they were overseas? Of the group, 51 per cent were very well satisfied; 41 per cent were satisfied; 6 per cent were dissatisfied; and 2 per cent were very dissatisfied.

3. What did they think about certain specific aspects of working overseas?

a. *Supervision.* In evaluating their supervisors, 43 per cent thought their supervisor was one of the best; 31 per cent thought he was pretty good; 22 per cent, that he had some weaknesses; and 4 per cent, that he was one of the worst they had known.

b. *Problems.* Of the things that bothered them, 15 per cent were troubled by the climate; 15 per cent, by lack of recreational opportunities; 3 per cent, by lack of companionship; and 32 per cent, by poor housing conditions.

Some 50 per cent were bothered by none of these.¹

When asked specifically about housing, 17 per cent said it was totally inadequate; 37 per cent, that it was somewhat inferior; 12 per cent, that it was about the same as in the United States; and 32 per cent, that it was better than they had had in the United States.

c. *Realization of motives.* The following percentages of employees said overseas opportunities had met their expectations on the points listed: saving money, 23; prestige, 3; novelty and excitement, 23; serving their country, 30; advancement, 13.

d. *Medical service.* On this point, 6 per cent said it was inadequate; 53 per cent, that it was somewhat inferior to that available in the United States; 33 per cent, that it was about the same; and 6 per cent, that it was better.

e. *Educational facilities.* Seven per cent found educational facilities totally inadequate; 48 per cent, somewhat inferior; 22 per cent, about the same as in the United States; 5 per cent, better; and 14 per cent offered no opinion.

f. *Attitudes towards citizens of country in which located.* Two per cent found that these citizens had different customs which made it hard to understand them; 16 per cent believed in treating these citizens as though they were Americans; 62 per cent said they thought it important to learn about local culture and to understand local citizens better; 11 per cent said they tried to help local citizens because that is United States policy; while 8 per cent indicated different attitudes.

g. *Attitudes of local citizens toward Americans.* Four per cent said local citizens either resented Americans or were withdrawn from them; 42 per cent saw a mixed picture, with some local citizens friendly and some hostile; 43 per cent found local citizens very friendly toward the United States; and 9 per cent said local citizens were very grateful to the United States.

h. *Local food.* Eight per cent thought local food was dangerous; 38 per cent thought it healthful and liked it very much; and the remainder ranged between these extremes.

¹ Totals are not always 100 per cent; some persons gave more than one answer to some questions.

i. *Keeping informed about developments in the United States.* Three-fourths of the group read news articles about affairs in the United States and two-thirds listened to American radio broadcasts. Twenty per cent had United States newspapers sent to them; 66 per cent read American newspapers published abroad; 52 per cent read non-American newspapers printed in English; 21 per cent read foreign language newspapers; 4 per cent did not read newspapers regularly. About half had periodicals sent them from the United States; two-thirds read American periodicals published abroad; one-third read non-American English language periodicals; 13 per cent read foreign language periodicals; and 8 per cent read no periodicals regularly.

j. *Friends.* Eleven per cent had only American friends; 55 per cent had principally American friends; 29 per cent had about equal members of American and foreign friends; and 4 per cent had predominantly foreign friends.

4. What about the future of these Americans working overseas?

a. *Overseas career.* Forty-five per cent expected to make a permanent career overseas; 26 wanted to stay on, but not permanently; 27 per cent were undecided; and 2 per cent did not want to stay under any circumstances.

b. *Future jobs.* Twelve per cent said they could get another job immediately within the United States; 66 per cent thought they could get such a job easily; while 18 per cent expected difficulties in obtaining other positions when they returned.

Six per cent said they would return to the job they had left in the United States; 14 per cent said they might return to the same job; 36 per cent said they would not return to the same job; 7 per cent had not worked immediately before going overseas; and 34 per cent expected to stay overseas.

c. *Location upon return to the United States.* Twenty-four per cent expecting to return to the United States expected to live in the same place; 13 per cent said they would go back to the same place but that they might move soon; 10 per cent would not go back to the same place; and 50 per cent said the loca-

tion of their next jobs in the United States would determine where they lived.

On the basis of the data supplied by the questionnaires and informal conversations with members of the group, it would seem that the major problems that were bothering employees overseas in the summer of 1952 were inadequate housing in many places, lack of job security, and the difficulties connected with military-civilian relations in defense establishments overseas. The last point was mentioned frequently in the conversations.

Lack of adequate housing was leading to a number of serious problems. It kept some people from accepting jobs; if they did accept jobs, they had to wait a long time in many instances to bring their families overseas; and

the adjustment of the family to the new environment was hindered when the quarters were inadequate.

Lack of security in overseas employment had resulted primarily in difficulties in recruitment. In some cases it seemed to lead to fears that could affect the job performance of those already employed overseas.

Difficult civilian-military relations were due to a number of factors. Problems were created where generally trained officers supervised highly trained specialists. Many officers overseas had had no previous experience in supervising civilians. The turnover among officers and civilians impeded the establishment of effective relations which can result from working together over a period of time. Other factors were the different compensation systems and privileges of officers and civilians.

Popularizing an Interest in Administration

The projection into structure of the attack on men and measures was helped by an attitude that is inherently wholesome but subject to exaggeration and misapplication. It is wholesome to direct attention to administration and to encourage the belief that rational improvement is possible. But interest in administration, like a little knowledge, may be a dangerous thing. For in foreign affairs especially, things never go quite right and there is a constant temptation to seek a scapegoat. If the scapegoat is the structure, we may bedevil ourselves to the end of time by cherishing the illusion that there is somehow a simple, decisive, frictionless way of arranging the organization. I confine this remark to the field of foreign affairs and particularly to the department mainly concerned with their conduct. Nevertheless I wonder whether the danger of the will-o'-the-wisp I mention does not carry a general warning to remember in popularizing an interest in administration. The sickening frequency and now apparently automatic newspaperman's use of the word streamlining are signs enough of the muddy middle ground that must be crossed in achieving a mature sympathy for organization as one of the greatest resources of a people.

—Arthur W. MacMahon, *Administration in Foreign Affairs* (University of Alabama Press, 1953), pp. 70-71.

New Broom at the Town Hall?

THE efficiency survey undertaken at Coventry by an Organization and Methods team from the Treasury is having widespread repercussions throughout the whole field of local government. The Treasury experts put forward proposals which they believed would enable Coventry City Council to save at least £50,000 a year (equal to 10 per cent of the City's present administrative overheads) and to dispense with about 120 of their staff. And there will be a reasonable suspicion that the scope for economy in most local authorities is greater, perhaps much greater, than at Coventry—which voluntarily invited the Treasury to expose the skeletons in its cupboard (and paid for them to do so) because of its interest in improving efficiency.

Unfortunately, however, the Treasury's major proposals seem to be a mistake. They are a mistake because they tend to ignore the fact that the cheapest form of public administration is not necessarily the best; and because they point the way—perhaps unconsciously—to a reversal of traditional conceptions of local democracy.

These conceptions centre around the committee system and the independence accorded to various departments. The first principle of local government, as it has developed in England, is that councillors should exercise a close control over the details of day-to-day administration. They do so through their standing committees; generally there is one standing committee for each of the principal local services. No matter is too obscure to be placed on a committee's agenda, although in practice a good chief officer can lead his committee by the nose on most matters. The second principle is that the head of each department is, in general and subject to the control of his committee, the master in his own house. The Clerk has come to be recognized as the council's chief officer, but he does not normally concern himself with the policies or with the in-

ternal efficiency of the individual departments. Their independence is in turn further reinforced by the strong protective loyalty which a committee usually displays towards the department for which it is responsible.

Apart from one weakness, these conventions work very well. The weakness is that they tend towards a dispersal of responsibility and a lack of co-ordination between the council's various activities. While individual departments may be well run, the total efficiency of the local authority may suffer. The three most important proposals in the Treasury experts' report are all designed to remedy this lack of co-ordination.

*

In the first place, the experts call for the establishment of a powerful new committee, which would exercise a general control over the organisation and staffing of all departments. At present the main instrument of internal control is the finance committee, but its authority is often weakened by allowing the chairmen of the principal committees to sit on it *ex officio*. The Treasury experts are flatly opposed to this system; and they believe that by taking over all responsibility for establishment work their new committee would also be able to avoid the suggestion that this function of control "is a negative one tied closely to the cutting of costs." The Treasury, of course, is used to control over establishments in its own domain of central government; but a little reflection suggests that the recipe proposed—a clear separation of administrative and financial functions, with seniority accorded to the committee responsible for the former—is a strange export to come out of Whitehall.

Secondly, the experts want all the standing committees to delegate responsibility more freely to their chief officers. Without doubt, time and money could be saved if it were not necessary to get committee approval for every decision taken and every pound expended.

NOTE: This article is reprinted from 170 *The Economist* (London) 516-18 (February 20, 1954).

Most committees certainly concern themselves too much with the minutiae of administration and too little with the larger questions of policy; but this is due less to any inherent defects in the system than to the level of interest and understanding of what Jeremy Bentham once called the "lay gents" who sit on them. There can be no cure for this but the education of councillors in the problems of modern administration, a task which most chief officers cheerfully essay; indeed they essay it so cheerfully that they probably do not want more power devolved upon themselves. The real point of local government would surely be lost if committee men were prevented from expressing a lay point of view (however foolish) on any matter (however small).

The experts' third proposal is the most sweeping of all: it is a proposal that would in effect radically alter the status of the Town Clerk and the work of his department. Instead of acting primarily as secretary and legal adviser to the council, the team proposes that the Clerk should become an efficiency expert responsible for "the effectiveness and economy of all administrative arrangements throughout the Corporation." Instead of achieving a limited amount of co-ordination on particular matters by means of persuasion, the Clerk would be asked "to ensure that administrative activities . . . are effectively co-ordinated." Instead of intervening as little as possible and always by indirect means in the affairs of other departments, he would "bring to the notice of Departments (and, if necessary, Committees) the need for any change." Under these proposals the Clerk (who would take on the additional title of Chief Administrative Officer) would exercise a large measure of control over the staffing and the organisation of the other departments. It is usual at present to give the chief officers considerable latitude in appointing and selecting their own staff, so long as they keep within the fairly flexible upper limits that are periodically settled by the Council. The Treasury officials are opposed to this latitude. They believe that the Clerk's department should exercise a continuous oversight over staffing, that it should recruit centrally all the staff to non-professional grades which are common to more than one department, and

that it should investigate and determine all requests for additional staff.



The eventual object behind these proposals is the creation of a new post in local government which would have little in common with the traditional role of the Town Clerk. The new functions are ascribed to the Clerk as a matter of expediency and economy, but it is emphasised that his post would in future have a "purely administrative nature" and that it would be thrown open to future generations "on the basis of their administrative abilities and not primarily of their professional or technical qualifications." In other words, the Clerk would not need to be a lawyer. To make their intentions on this point quite clear, the Treasury experts argue that the Clerk ought no longer to act as the Council's legal adviser, since this would weaken the office "by the association of unrelated activities." His legal functions would be handed over to a small separate department.

These proposals go almost half-way towards embracing the American idea of the City manager, who takes orders (on matters of policy only) from the Council, but who has complete authority over the heads of departments. By applying business methods to local government, the manager can usually effect economies. The system achieves especially good results in the management of public utilities, but in the administration of the personal services it would be likely to hamper the initiative and independence of the chief officers and of their committees—without very much reward. This danger is recognised in local government statutes in this country which confer specific duties on certain of the chief officers, with whose execution nobody (the Clerk included) has a right to interfere. They are statutes that should be retained. Once the case for circumscribing the Clerk's authority over other departments is thus granted, however, the case for divesting him of legal responsibilities and qualifications becomes much less strong. Most clerks are in fact appointed—even under the present system—primarily on their reputation as administrators. But since the activities of local authorities are closely governed by law and conven-

tion, it is a convenience that the chief officer should have legal knowledge; and if the Clerk is to get his way (both with his own councillors and with Government departments) mainly by the exercise of tact and diplomacy and of skill in negotiation, a legal training is as good a training as any other in how to quibble with a smile.

It does not follow that all the proposals in the Treasury report should be dismissed out of hand. Some centralisation of the recruitment and training of local government staff may well be desirable, and the possibilities of establishing an Organisation and Methods service within local government warrant close examination. It is also desirable to have a strong and independent committee watching over the general efficiency of the local authority's work

(although, if economy is the aim, a strengthening of the status of the finance committee would seem to be the best way), and to give the Clerk stronger powers to effect such co-ordination as is needed. Some of the larger authorities might also experiment in the appointment of clerks who are not lawyers. Coventry City Council has accepted, in principle, the proposals in the report that can be effected without a drastic change in traditional conventions. But it is understandable that Coventry should be cautious (and other local authorities will be more so) about the wisdom of embarking upon broader experiments. Indeed, perhaps one of the happiest consequences of this research experiment is that it should have taught some people at the Treasury what local government is about.

Coventry

Those engaged on O and M work will probably have noticed with some interest the reports which have been appearing in the press about the Treasury O and M assignment in Coventry, and the arguments to which these reports have given rise.

It was with some hesitation that, about two years ago, the Treasury O and M Division accepted the Corporation's invitation to examine their organisation. The work lay outside their normal bailiwick, but it seemed a useful opportunity for a further test in a field where O and M was not yet widely applied. The Corporation and their officers showed themselves extremely helpful throughout the assignment, and, as might be expected from the enterprise they had shown, their organisation proved in many ways to be very efficient. Nevertheless it was possible to make recommendations for the improvement of organisation and procedures and for further mechanisation, which together should in due course produce substantial economies.

The team also drew some general conclusions applicable by inference to all local authorities, which have attracted more controversy. The public comment, whether favourable or unfavourable to the team's recommendations, has been so voluminous that it should lead many other local authorities to think about the need for self-examination. This may cause them to follow the good example of those authorities which have already made arrangements individually or co-operatively for an O and M service.

Report of Conference Sessions Annual Meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, 1954

THE summaries of the panel sessions of the annual conference of the Society, prepared by their rapporteurs, are reproduced below.

The following telegram from the President of the United States was read to the membership by President John A. Perkins:

The White House
Washington, D. C.
March 19, 1954

John A. Perkins
American Society for Public Administration
Conrad Hilton Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

I am happy to learn that the American Society for Public Administration is holding its annual meeting beginning today.

In an age marked by the widespread influence of the federal government in the lives of one hundred sixty million Americans, the extraordinary importance of your work, of your skill and your devotion to duty should be clear to everyone. The nation owes to all competent and dedicated public administrators a debt of deep gratitude.

For its efforts in encouraging good public administration, your society has my warmest congratulations, and all your members have my best wishes for an enjoyable, stimulating meeting.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

Career Systems in Review

Chairman—Leonard D. White, Professor of Public Administration, The University of Chicago

Panel—Garret L. Bergen, Vice President, Marshall Field and Company, Chicago; Alastair Mackay, United Kingdom Treasury and Supply Delegation; John W. Macy, Jr., Executive Director, U. S. Civil Service Commission; Lt. Gen. Willard S. Paul, USA, Ret., Office of Defense Mobilization; William J. Ronan, Dean, Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service, New York University

Commentators—Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority; Herbert Emmerich, Director, Public Administration Clearing House; Lloyd

M. Short, Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota

Rapporteur—Seymour S. Berlin, Chief, Program Planning Division, U. S. Civil Service Commission

Mr. White opened the session by stating that the panel was to consider one of the major domestic problems of statecraft—"how to create in the first instance and how to maintain a career service in the field of administration." The panel members discussed the problems of career service in big organizations from a number of points of view.

General Paul pointed out that the big business of the Army, which is "ten times the size of some of our biggest businesses," needs good personnel management. Five general principles would seem to encompass good person-

nel management: (1) placing the right man in the right job through proper man-job analysis, classification, and assignment; (2) increasing his availability for work by protecting his welfare; (3) stimulating his desire to produce with adequate incentives; (4) increasing his capacity to produce through adequate training; and (5) utilizing him fully on essential tasks.

General Paul described the Army career system and detailed some of the areas which need strengthening. The service academies, West Point and Annapolis, furnish only 6 per cent of officer material. The great bulk comes in through R.O.T.C. and up through the ranks. Wherever possible, the standard of a college degree is used. Physical and character standards are of great importance also. General Paul believes the Army has unnecessarily high physical standards, and he has been fighting to modify them for years.

The Army's training and development program for officers is divided into four major periods, each of seven years. The officer starts by learning the fundamental tools of his trade; he then progresses through the various service schools and periods of planned assignments according to his demonstrated aptitudes, interests, and background. Promotion through the ranks accompanies the officer's training and development. Ruthless elimination takes place during the probationary period, and specific retirement requirements are used to prevent a bottleneck at the top. Executive development in the Army includes on-the-job training through all grades, as well as attendance at the service schools. In addition, a number of officers are selected each year to attend universities throughout the country. Despite this excellent program the present professional officer corps is inadequate. There must be better personnel policies in the future that will provide "stability," "happiness in the job," and a "better human relations approach."

Mr. Bergen stated at the outset that he was going to underestimate the problems of recruiting people and overemphasize the development of employees. The key to development is "climate" at the top of the business. The way the business is run, the way policies and goals are set, the method of communication, the clarification of organizational lines, and the extent of delegation of authority are the fundamental determinants of the kind of executive

development that will take place. Policies and principles are more important than techniques; executive development will be only a "fad" if it is discussed, interpreted, and installed in terms of techniques without being founded on principles.

Mr. Bergen listed some of the principles important to sound management development. Management must be understood as the responsibility for guiding and coordinating the physical and human resources of a business into a dynamic organizational unit. It is important to recognize that the management job is becoming increasingly complex and that it is a self-contained activity unlike any other. Management requires people with necessary qualifications that call for definite preparation. Since no one can develop an executive except himself, the job of management is to make it easy for him to do so.

Mr. Bergen discussed some of the methods used to accomplish the objectives of development. Decentralized management responsibility with centralized coordination is important. The worst thing for executive development is a "paper program," since management develops an attitude rather than a program. The process of inventorying is important; it includes inventory of what is now being done, what are the present and future requirements of the business, and who are the people in the business and what are their potential and talent. The inventory process involves methods of appraisal. In the last few years the group appraisal and group conference methods have been widely adopted. Mr. Bergen summarized career development needs in an organization as (1) "systemization" of an effective program, (2) removal of barriers, and (3) recognition that development and training are more important than selection.

Mr. Mackay described the British civil service career system, paying particular attention to the administrative grade. The competitive examining requirements are based on the general educational system of the country. Examinations for the clerical and executive classes are based on the ordinary school curriculum; the examination for the administrative class is devised to obtain graduates from as wide a range of academic curriculums as is reasonably practical. The British system presupposes that

a good liberal education is the best preparation and does not seek specialists of any kind.

While selection methods are important, Mr. Mackay believes that it is more important that the service should be able to "hold the interest, exercise the ability, and bring out in every way the best in the members of the staff throughout their long careers." The chief problem, therefore, is the organization and management of the public service in the widest sense. Mr. Mackay listed the following features of the civil service as important: common competitive entry, reasonable standards of pay and pension and other conditions of service, fair and reasonable promotion prospects, and in-service training.

Security appears to be a much more important consideration in the British than in the United States civil service. Security in the British service applies up to the highest ranks, and promotion is open to career officers, according to their ability, up to the very top. The system's nonspecialization and flexible movement of personnel permits the British to deal with any problems that may arise as a result of having men in the service for a lifetime. A firm tradition and *esprit de corps* help them through difficulties and assist in sustaining the measure of public confidence and esteem which the British system enjoys.

Mr. Ronan described the New York state career system which has been a pioneer in the field of merit systems. The state has an excellent service with competent people, for the most part, in positions of career leadership. The career system originated as a means of getting rid of spoilsmein in public office. The constitution provides stringent regulations regarding the appointment and promotion of people within the career ranks, and a rather detailed civil service law has spelled out some of the principles of the state service and a number of the practices as well. The state service, because of its origins, has tended to emphasize examining routine and mechanical operations at the expense of a more positive personnel policy and program.

The state's classification system compares favorably with that of other public jurisdictions. However, it has some disadvantages for developing executive talent because of the number of "pigeon-hole" classifications. The rigidity of the promotion system, based on ex-

aminations which measure subject-matter knowledge rather than capacity and potential, has tended to departmentalize and limit promotion opportunities.

The "climate" in the New York service is good. The service has not been subjected to layoffs for partisan reasons. Pay scales are good and the public is aware of employment opportunities in the service. The state government "high command" has recently become more appreciative of a sound personnel program, and a public administration program was inaugurated after World War II that includes postgraduate university study, in-service training courses, and administrative internships.

Mr. Ronan believes that the state has not thought through the proper limits of the career service. There is an unevenness among departments in the jobs that are in the career service with career tenure, and there has not been developed on a career basis an administrative officer in each department who can provide continuity during changes of administration.

Mr. Macy stated that he would talk about an action program for the civil service today. The new Civil Service Commission concluded at the outset that there was a need to define the "career service." The federal service has changed rapidly in size and character, mushrooming from 800,000 to 4,000,000 during the war years and standing now at slightly under 2,300,000. Although the possibility of fluctuation is always present, there is no prospect of a large-scale reduction of federal employment so long as the atmosphere of cold war and semi-mobilization persists. The service must also be flexible in order to meet emergency needs as they arise.

The career service must provide status and tenure for its members, but the upper limit of the career service must also be determined. To that end the commission initiated Schedule "C." Of 915 positions that have been placed in this schedule, only 232 are transfers from the competitive service. The balance are new jobs created by the administration to meet particular needs. Only 8 per cent of the positions in the top four grades of the Classification Act are outside the competitive service. There has been no wholesale elimination of jobs from the competitive service at any level.

The commission has formulated an action program for consideration by top management

and, where necessary, for presentation to the Congress for the enactment of appropriate statutes. Many of the proposals are not new and many are partially in effect; what is needed is an integrated program of broad coverage that will establish sound personnel management in the federal service. Mr. Macy said the federal service must look ahead and specifically determine its needs for executive, professional, scientific, and high-level technical personnel. With some 15,000 different occupations, the federal government should recognize the existence of careers in the scientific and technical areas.

Mr. Macy stressed the need for cultivating sources of recruitment into the federal service. Closer collaboration with the colleges and universities in the development and identification of students for the federal service and closer coordination within the federal government in its approach to college students are necessary. Attention must be given to selection devices for entry into the service. The government must have a dynamic career service which calls for the principle of promotion from within but must be coupled with a program of hiring competent people from the outside.

The federal government must give more attention to individual motivation and job satisfaction. The whole area of human relations and attitudes of employees requires closer study. It is important to focus greater attention on the identification of employees with potential so that careers can be mapped for them. Much remains to be done in training. The concept of intern programs throughout the federal service should be expanded. There is a need for greater recognition of the value of an exchange program between specialties as well as between functional programs. The federal government should also give its employees opportunities for nongovernmental training.

In asserting leadership in a career development program, the Civil Service Commission constantly underscores the desirability of freedom from restriction. Agency and departmental managements must be able to do a creative job with respect to their own personnel to meet their own programs and operational requirements. Mr. Macy emphasized the urgency of attention to the problem of the prestige of

the public service in the American community.

Mr. Short commented on the presentations of panel members from the point of view of college students. There is a prevailing attitude on university campuses that tends to play down the importance, the challenge, and opportunity of a career in the public service. The development of city-manager-governed cities, however, has resulted in a marked increase in interest among college students in employment in local jurisdictions. Although there are many advantages of decentralization of recruiting and selection in the federal service, there are some disadvantages from the point of view of the college campus. The Civil Service Commission has a real responsibility to avoid the waste of effort and the unnecessary duplication that appear to be prevalent in the recruiting of college students by the various government agencies.

Mr. Clapp devoted his comments to a consideration of attitudes with respect to management in the public service and of the problems attendant upon the choice of means of expressing those attitudes. He underlined the need for clarity of policy and purpose and for an organization that frees people to do a good job and creates conditions that cause them to grow and develop. Management in the public service must be prepared and have the courage to assume responsibility for the mistakes of its developing executives. Mr. Clapp deplored the concept that successful management in the federal service depends upon the ability to get along with the Congress rather than upon truthfully explaining to the Congress what the needs of the executive branch might be.

It is important that people know where they stand and the course of their progress during their careers in the federal service. Mr. Clapp stated that "we must recognize that our public has been living in a period of an intense and sustained campaign which, whether so intended or not, is basically anti-government and has a heavy touch of anti-intellect." The natural effect is to reduce the attractiveness of the service. Mr. Clapp believes, however, that this is not the time to become pessimistic about the future of the public service; we should encourage young people to enter the public service field by every means possible.

Program Budgeting

Chairman—Bert W. Johnson, City Manager, Evanston, Illinois

Panel—John A. Donaho, John A. Donaho and Associates, Baltimore; Reece Harrill, Associate Director, Accounting Systems Division, General Accounting Office; L. Felix Joyner, Director, Division of the Budget, Kentucky; Frederick C. Mosher, Associate Professor of Political Science, Syracuse University; Leo C. Riethmayer, Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Colorado

Rapporteur—Robert L. Funk, Assistant Director, Municipal Finance Officers Association

Several approaches have been made to budgeting, ranging from the early practice of budgeting strictly by object of expenditure and by organizational unit to the present concept of budgeting by programs. In this concept, budgeting is done in terms of the end product for which government has been established: namely, to perform services for its citizenry or to regulate services to be performed. Although the program approach to budgeting may differ from the earlier approaches, at some stage of the budget process budgeting must be by object and organization unit. Budgeting by object is considered at some level of program budgeting since persons, property, supplies, and equipment are related to the work to be accomplished. Budgeting by organization occurs since responsibility for the performance of a function or activity must be established. Thus, in many instances, program budgeting may be additive to other budget methods.

The program budget approach has a number of distinct advantages. It brings meaning to a maze of figures and eases the tasks both of the administrator and of the legislator. Through it the executive can evaluate programs and can determine the effectiveness of performance. Through it the legislator can weigh the value of a given program as against alternative programs or determine whether the program should be performed at all. Further, the legislator has a tool through which he can more adequately review and appraise the effectiveness of management. For both legislator and administrator it is a means of definitely placing responsibility for the performance of a function, activity, or subactivity.

The program budget approach will vary with the size of the governmental unit. Techniques and methods satisfactory for the smaller unit may be inadequate for the larger governmental agency, owing to the greater spread between the policy formation and the smaller operational levels in the larger unit. Program budgeting in the larger units must recognize that differences do exist as to the type and kind of information needed at the various administrative and policy levels, and must supply information required by the different levels. In the larger governmental agency budgeting by "multiplication" occurs at a level far removed from the operational level and in such a manner that the operational level may have very little to do with the process. Budgeting by multiplication is in contrast to budgeting by addition, in which the sums of the objects of expenditure can be related directly to programs and summation by activities and organizational unit can be readily achieved to determine total needs. Budgeting by multiplication or "centralization," affected as it is by long lead periods requiring extended long-range forecasts, does not produce budgets that are "balanced" in the traditional sense. A margin of error can result and should be recognized as a possibility.

Program budgets can be developed for all governmental activities but each may require a different technique and approach. This does not mean merely a change in the budget format but may require step-by-step development of organization, staff, accounting, measuring techniques, and standards and reports.

A serviceable system of program budgeting involves every division and level of operation in a governmental agency and requires cooperative effort at all levels. For such a system to be effective, the functions and processes of planning, budgeting, scheduling, accounting, and reporting must be coordinated. None of these activities can be performed effectively without management and management techniques, including the recruitment and training of competent personnel.

Program budgeting requires that the course determined by an agency and the work planned by it be well defined in terms of what is expected to be accomplished expressed as objectives or quantitative accomplishments. The budget translates these goals into monetary

amounts to be expended for their accomplishment. Scheduling then establishes the order of accomplishment in relation to time elements, covering what is to be done, when it is to be done, and what is required in terms of money. Accounting searches out and segregates all elements of expense incurred in attaining a purpose or program, assembling expenditures according to the organization responsible for performance and at the same time showing the cost of work accomplished in terms of programs, activities, and special features. Finally, effective control of expenditures and purposes can be achieved only through a reporting system that will funnel the information required for administrative and legislative action in a form that will be useful at the level at which the information is to be utilized. All these phases of program budgeting demand the use of a common denominator—a standard classification of accounts—which is consistently used throughout the entire process and which permits summarization or preparation of data to be used at various levels.

One major problem in program budgeting is the measurement of work loads and program accomplishments. In this area extreme caution must be observed. Many administrators have sought standards for use in the budget format and when no actual standards were available have unwisely chosen arbitrary ones. A first step in establishing standards should be a measurement of present accomplishments, but measurement cannot be realistic without a reasonable experience under a good accounting system. Whatever the ultimate goal, the best initial standard is one under which the current program is operating. Work load statistics may be gathered from other agencies or divisions within the governmental unit, from other units or agencies, or from national organizations. However, statistics of operations from other organizations and sources should be used only for general guidance and should not be substituted for present standards within the unit until the present standards are determined.

The program budget requires review and evaluation at every step in its formation and at every level. In the absence of well defined work loads and standards of measurement, the problem of evaluating the impact of a given program can be extremely difficult. For many services, the difficulty of evaluation can be

troublesome—particularly for staff services and for such functions as planning and zoning. But whatever the problems that may be encountered in establishing a program budget, it is more informative than other types of budget to the legislature, to management, and to the public. Its usefulness as a technique and approach will improve as its use becomes more widespread and intensive.

Teaching Public Administration

Chairman—Charles S. Hyneman, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University

Panel—James C. Charlesworth, Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania; O. B. Conaway, Jr., Assistant Director, U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School; Catheryn Seckler-Hudson, Chairman, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, The American University; Frank P. Sherwood, Assistant Professor of Public Administration, University of Southern California; George H. Watson, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Roosevelt College; E. S. Wengert, Head, Department of Political Science, University of Oregon

Rapporteur—Paul N. Ylvisaker, Associate Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College

Mr. Charlesworth opened with a systematic and forceful statement of his approach to the teaching of public administration. Arguing that one could not properly choose materials without first defining objectives, Mr. Charlesworth fired passing volleys both at what he termed "the recent attempt to make the teaching of public administration abstruse and recondite," and at the other extreme of over-emphasizing administrative trivia and technique. "Too much effort is being devoted to staff and management, not enough to the basic purposes of government. . . . It is important to learn how to administer, but more so to learn how to ascertain whether the program administered is adequate." To do so requires the use of three complementary methods: conventional class study of underlying principles; field projects; and "substantive study of ad-

ministrative methods." Texts, cases, field research, exhaustive bibliographical suggestions, "mountains of relevant mimeographed materials," and regular sessions with practicing administrators all have a place in such a training program. So, too, a three-stage approach is needed to each of the major line programs of government—marking out first, what ought to be; second, what is; and finally, an amalgam which for the administrative trainee becomes a usable set of recommended practices and objectives.

Mr. Sherwood shared Mr. Charlesworth's concern for the substantive side of public administration—"the student should hear less about POSDCORB and more about program." Judging, however, from university catalogs and available texts, Mr. Sherwood doubts whether the emphasis on program is finding its way into the curriculum. Two attempts to this end have been made at the University of Southern California: one, a course entitled "Program Administration" which covers each of the various line functions and uses a text specially written to give the "citizens' view" of administration; the second, a specialized course in "The Administration of the Department of Defense." The second has proved the more effective, and prompts the conclusion that an undergraduate major in public administration might well be built around a combination of single-program courses. For materials, Mr. Sherwood looks to memoirs, diaries, public papers, and biographies, rather than to conventional texts. And while the program idea and case method are "country cousins," even the Stein casebook "is too much the survey approach." What is needed is a set of cases in a single program area.

Catheryn Seckler-Hudson described in some detail the well-known "Washington Semester Program," which—in cooperation with over fifty colleges and universities—makes it possible for selected undergraduates to "study national government on the spot and as it happens." The program is based on four components: a common seminar; individual research projects; course work individually arranged; and "other events." The last includes a variety of exposures to governmental life in Washington: visits to offices, sessions with public officials and administrators, social gatherings, and so forth.

Mr. Conaway addressed his comments to the

particular problems encountered by the United States Department of Agriculture Graduate School in providing a vast assortment of technical courses to some 5,000 students a year, most of them public servants. One problem is "to relate and generalize" in a setting of student interests which are largely particular; another is to encourage discussion without being overwhelmed by an outpouring of anecdotes and accounts of personal experience. In choosing materials, the staff of the Graduate School have relied heavily on government documents; are turning increasingly to group participation (debating, role-playing, etc.); and in the way of texts express a general preference for the kind of approach followed by Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson. Visual materials are popular, but expensive. Cases are of no use at introductory and middle levels, partly because the students have their own reservoir of operating experience to draw upon, partly because published cases are "either too big or too small."

Mr. Wengert, on a more general plane, stated that he was "personally and profoundly disturbed by the question, 'What is there about public administration that can be taught?'" The question poses successive problems of purpose and method: one must first develop and make explicit a conception of society and, in that perspective, define the role of public administration. Having done this, one can then properly discuss method. Mr. Wengert's own prescription is to shun appearances of certainty, to approach principles with caution, and to create in the teacher the same fundamental anxieties characteristic of our age. The case method is ideal for the purpose, in that cases stimulate the continuing question "What is it all about?" and by so doing overcome apathy in the student and remind the teacher that his proper function is more to raise the meaningful questions than to provide stock answers.

Mr. Watson—on leave this year to study the pedagogical problems of the case method—was particularly concerned with the plight of the liberal arts college teacher whose resources and time are limited. Such a teacher cannot import administrative authorities into his classroom, or develop mountains of mimeographed materials, or bring his students into intimate contact with administrators in the field. Text-

books are one answer, but only if it is assumed that public administration is a neatly delineated field and its principles well tested and defined. Case studies are more promising. They provide vicarious experience, and a meaningful appreciation of the dimensions of the field of study; in addition, they communicate a sense of the pressures under which administrators act, and minimize one of the hazards of undergraduate instruction—the acquiring of mere verbal facility. For teaching purposes, the best cases are the shorter ones, and particularly those which by literary skill capture the essential art of public administration and human relations.

Motivation: A Fundamental Factor in Public Administration

Participants—Robert L. Kahn, Program Director, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; Rensis Likert, Director, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; Alvin Zander, Program Director, Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan

In recent years administrators are becoming increasingly aware that the effectiveness of any organization is influenced substantially by the motivation, attitudes, and behavior of the people who comprise it. But being aware of a responsibility is only one of the conditions needed to handle the responsibility; it is necessary also to develop the understanding and the skills which lead to effective administrative action.

To demonstrate one factor in motivation—the way behavior toward people depends upon perception of their status and role—Mr. Zander led the audience in an “experiment.” He formed the audience into small “committees” with a problem to solve, then introduced to each committee two new members from the audience who were assigned, without their knowledge, high status (the mayor) and low status (a departmental clerk). Following the deliberations of the committees, the members assigned the high and low status were asked to report how they felt about their committees and how they were treated. The high-status

members, mayors, reported general satisfaction with the committees on which they served and a feeling of being valued, stimulated, and accepted; the departmental clerks on the contrary reported that they felt insecure, resentful, and uncertain of their place in the group. Mr. Zander observed that the relations between people, the way they treat one another, and the effects they have on one another are very dependent upon such factors as prestige, status, and role in the group. The importance of this characteristic manner of behavior becomes evident when the adverse effect of rejection upon subordinates is measured.

The Institute for Social Research is engaged in long-range programs of research which are focused on discovering the principles and practices of organizational structure and leadership which contribute to maximum organizational performance. Mr. Likert presented some of the trends in the findings:

1. Within an organization, high-productive employees are not much different from low-productive employees in their attitudes toward the organization and its policies, but they differ in many ways in their attitudes regarding matters immediate to their work situation—supervision, job, fellow employees.

2. Supervisors who are “employee-centered” rather than “production-centered”—i.e., see their responsibility mainly in terms of people—tend to obtain higher productivity and higher morale. Many supervisors and superiors, however, continue to practice production-centered leadership.

3. It is beginning to appear that relations in the work group—the sense of belonging to the group, loyalty, and pride in the work team—are of critical importance to effective management. The influence of the group, however, may be either favorable or unfavorable. Supervision appears to be a major factor in determining both the level of group loyalty and whether it exerts a positive or negative influence upon the performance of the organization.

These findings were illustrated from research in a variety of organizations in which the job situations of high-productive and high-morale employees were compared with the situations of low-productive and low-morale employees.

Experimental applications of the findings were reported to yield improved performance.

The implications of research findings such as these are of interest but not of practical consequence unless some means can be developed to put the knowledge to work in a widespread manner. Mr. Kahn described some experiences of Institute for Social Research teams in exploring ways to change the practices of supervisors and of organizations in their leadership practices. These experiences have led to the conclusion that it is not enough to present and discuss research findings in elaborate formal training programs. To obtain a significant improvement it seems to be necessary to secure measurements which show the current human relations situation in the organization and to help the members of the organization to interpret these measurements through discussions in which the broader human relations research findings are also cited. This sets up the processes of change in the context of daily work so that all members, including the top, of the organizations are influenced. Some first experiments in this approach of training organizations rather than individuals have been most promising.

Problems of Metropolitan Areas

Chairman—Robert E. Merriam, Alderman, City of Chicago

Panel—Robert E. Baumberger, City Manager, Superior, Wisconsin; Philip Hammer, Hammer and Company, Inc., Atlanta; Victor Jones, Professor of Government, Wesleyan University; Samuel C. May, Director, Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley; John L. Scott, Village Manager, Park Forest, Illinois

Rapporteur—John E. Dever, City Manager, Two Rivers, Wisconsin

At each of the Society's annual conferences since World War II a session has been devoted to problems associated with metropolitan areas. This year, two sessions, morning and afternoon, touched upon many of the practical solutions that are being attempted, as well as some of the techniques and approaches that might be tried in the future.

The problem in the United States was stated by Mr. Jones as one of finding a means by which ninety million people who live in the metropolitan areas of this country can govern themselves in an effective, democratic, acceptable fashion. The solution to this problem was represented as having nationwide significance because of its size; the increase in metropolitan area populations and the accompanying migration of people; the importance of central cities and their welfare to national well-being; and the rapid growth of fringe areas. Mr. Jones suggested that the United States government and the governments of the states must accept primary responsibility for bringing the various segments of metropolitan areas together for common solutions to their joint problems. He also said that some original thinking and experimenting must be attempted to find a means of organizing metropolitan governments that can cope with these problems.

Mr. Baumberger described the plight of a city that "over-annexed" territory, thereby consolidating many smaller communities that were not truly a part of the urban area. He pointed out that many cities today are being swept along by a "wave of optimism" and annexing great areas.

Superior, Wisconsin, went through such a period in the late 1880's. As a result it has a very low population density and high per capita costs for public services. Since outlying annexed areas are in fact a part of the city they expect urban services toward which they are paying, and these must be rendered even though the unit costs are comparatively high. Superior is now trying to remedy its situation by the use of strict zoning regulations. Annexations should be based on sound economic and social planning and should be accompanied by adequate zoning, building code, and platting regulations.

Mr. Hammer related the background and development of the "Plan of Improvement" for Atlanta, Georgia, and Fulton County, dating from 1938, through several recent unsuccessful attempts at consolidating Georgia's two largest governmental units, to adoption of the present consolidation of functions.

To gain facts and support for proposals, a citizen commission had a detailed economic

survey made to determine which functions would be performed most efficiently by each of the governmental units. To carry out the conclusions of the economic study, they proposed a plan embodying a combination of annexation and consolidation of functions which reflected the economics, the personalities, and the political institutions involved. Several functions, such as police, are furnished the whole county by the city on a contractual basis, while some 95 square miles have been annexed by the city and are receiving full urban services.

To enable the plan to be put into effect required adoption of nine amendments to the state Constitution and enactment of forty major state laws. Also, a referendum was carried in both the city and outlying areas. A great deal of public support and active citizen participation was necessary to accomplish these changes. Future needs were anticipated by providing for extensive contractual urban-type services until marginal areas reach a point where an "automatic" annexation procedure, set up by state statute, makes them part of the city.

Mr. May told of the unique way in which the metropolitan areas of California are handling their problems in a setting of tremendous population gains, little party politics, a liberal "home-rule" state Constitution, and a large corps of trained, professional, public servants. In the last few years attempts have been made in California at city-county consolidation, the setting up of numerous special districts and, finally, at legislative action to force annexation on unincorporated areas which were receiving urban-type services from the county partially at city expense. After a long legislative battle between associations representing city officials and county officials this last proposal was defeated. As a result, the Legislature set several committees to work on the problem and with the aid of both city and rural officials a solution was hit upon which is being tried very successfully in a number of locations throughout the state.

Under this system cities provide urban services within their corporate limits and counties perform similar services on a contractual basis for unincorporated areas which use and re-

quest urban-type services. Officials and organizations are not stopping here, however; and legislative committees and representatives of cities and counties are continuing to do research in the hope of finding better means of solving their common problems.

John L. Scott discussed the problems of a suburban "bedroom" town which contributes labor, and hence wealth, to its parent city. A detailed analysis of sales tax receipts, average income, and other statistics for the various municipalities in the Chicago area was presented to demonstrate that much of the suburban population is tending to become merely a typical urban population with a slightly larger proportion of upper-income groups. Since suburban governments do not have the kind of industrial development that is carrying a large share of the tax burden in most large cities, they must of necessity require residents to pay more taxes or provide them with limited and modified services.

In the general discussion that followed the panel presentation, mention was made of the plight of metropolitan areas that spread into two or more states and the experience in Great Britain of calculating optimum populations for which various functions can be performed most economically. The success of the city of Toronto, Canada, in annexing areas and separating strictly local functions from metropolitan-wide functions was described.

All speakers and participants agreed that there is urgent need to face the problems of metropolitan areas and that immediate consideration should be given to the problem at the national level. It was emphasized (1) that changes must be made at the state level so that cities and counties will have legal authority to try various solutions to their individual problems and situations and (2) that additional research and experimentation are needed in an atmosphere of urban-suburban-rural cooperation to meet what will surely be multiplying metropolitan problems in the near future.

Line-Staff Relations

Chairman—John B. Blandford, Jr., Government Relations Consultant, Washington, D. C.

Panel—Joseph E. Baldwin, Director, Department of Public Welfare, County of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; George E. Bean, City Manager, Peoria, Illinois; W. Palmer Dearing, M.D., Deputy Surgeon General, U. S. Public Health Service; Joe J. King, Industrial Relations Assistant, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; Frank M. Landers, Director, Budget Division, Michigan

Rapporteur—Howard A. Thayer, Chief of Technical Development, Directorate of Civilian Personnel, Headquarters, USAF, Washington, D. C.

The chairman introduced the panel and stated that it had voted full membership to all those present at the session. It hoped to develop the discussion generally along the following lines: (1) origins, objectives, and trends in the use of staff; (2) cooperation and conflict in line-staff relations; and (3) executive leadership in promoting line-staff teamwork.

The discussion proceeded informally. Comments and conclusions were generally in terms of desirable conduct for staff and executive—the line being considered as an established point of reference. It was emphasized, however, that the line must assume its full responsibility and accept and cooperate with all other components.

The concept of staff emerged out of the growth, size, and complexity of organizations. The staff exists because of necessity. Leaders (executives) have always had advisers and associates to help in plans and decisions—often unofficial in an organizational sense. Great need has fostered almost uncontrolled staff growth, favored by two factors: (1) operating personnel too busy and physically separated from the executive and (2) staff personnel conveniently at hand and free to give real assistance. From advice and information, the staff has moved into the functions of "control," inspection, coordination, and actual "decision-making"—all presumably responsibilities of the executive. Staff has filled in the gaps, occasionally doing line work as line components became too busy to carry all the responsibilities that are probably properly theirs. Some members of the panel expressed concern that staff has come to assume all those "thinking" or planning activities that cut across lines or de-

partments. Line and executive are inclined to concentrate on the immediate productive or operational activities. Staff work then develops in the other areas such as planning budget and support.

Staff activity and the relationships maintained with line and executive seem to be a direct response to the internal conditions in an organization and the personality and methods of the chief executive. There was agreement and emphasis on the point that the line must "do" and "control" the work of the organization. This concept recognizes the executive as the "head of the line" rather than an administrator. The staff is an auxiliary or service component to advise and support the line. This minimizing of the staff position was mentioned by most of the panel members.

Comments included: "The staff becomes what the chief wants"; "The staff must find its role and step into it and not be too prominent"; "The staff must persuade—not tell"; "The staff cannot have a rigid set of principles—it must be flexible and respond to a wide number of stimuli"; "The staff does not perform the actual work of the organization—it furnishes a variety of services to the workers"; "All staff men should first work in the line. Only those who have demonstrated the ability to do something should be allowed to be advisers on it."

The possible difference between staff work in the government (large-scale operation) and in industry or state and county government (small-scale operation) was discussed. It was agreed that staff techniques are different if organized around a process or production than if organized around a public service on the federal level. Staff work is admittedly more formal and more conspicuous in the federal government.

The philosophy and the practices of the chief executive are the determining factors in the position of staff in an organization. Contacts should be on the basis of informational and not decision-making purposes. Strong opinions were expressed against any entrance of the staff into decision-making other than the furnishing of data and information. Decisions are the prerogative and responsibility of the executive. He cannot delegate them down the line and he should not lose them to the staff.

It was accepted by the panel that there is conflict between line and staff. There appeared to be general agreement that it could be eliminated by mutual respect and understanding. Human weaknesses and personality factors predominate as causes.

Line attitudes were expressed as follows: "Staff gives advice without fully knowing or understanding a problem"; "Staff does not appreciate program priority and production"; "Staff knows the rules because the rules are staff-written"; "Government staff people throw their weight around—they have the facts and the tricks"; "Executives issue policy but it is not theirs—it is the policy of their staff writers."

Staff opinions were expressed as follows: "The line resents the staff—they say it does not help perform the mission or help do the actual work"; "Line personnel abdicate their responsibilities of coordination and planning—staff has to fill in the gaps"; "The line operators may know more about an operation than the staff but they are too busy to do anything except operate"; "The line has no time for planning and improving methods"; "The line wants to have all functions—they are too close to a process or problem to see all aspects of it"; "The line resents the staff because staff brings out line need for cooperation with other lines."

Constructive comments included: "If staff is ordered to produce a solution, they must find one regardless of effect on line"; "There are elements of staff work in every job"; "There is need for more integration of staff and line—the composite staff serving the composite line."

There was firm opinion that if the line fails to act in any of its traditional areas, staff will pick up and prosper in them and not easily release dominance thus established.

The chairman summarized the panel discussion with six specific conclusions stated as needs: (1) restate the roles of line and staff; (2) break down barriers; (3) improve terminology; (4) inspire line-staff action; (5) blend contributions to decisions; and (6) provide firm and wise executive leadership.

A constructive approach with frequent meetings of line and staff was recommended. In checking with each other, a clear concept of duties and benefits will evolve. Coordination, a staff relationship, may be the best educational process for better line-staff relationships. In

public administration staff and line both have a responsibility for providing the best possible service to the public.

Organizing Technical Assistance within a Country

Chairman—Alvin Roseman, Acting Director, Office of Public Services, Foreign Operations Administration

Panel—John D. Corcoran, Field Supervisor, Public Administration Service; Richard H. Demuth, Director, Technical Assistance and Liaison Staff, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; John B. Grant, M.D., Associate Director, Division of Medicine and Public Health, The Rockefeller Foundation; H. J. van Mook, Director, Public Administration Division, United Nations Technical Assistance Administration; William E. Warne, Director, U.S. Operations Mission to Iran

Rapporteur—Laurin L. Henry, Staff Assistant, Public Administration Clearing House

The central problem for the panel was how technical aid missions and the institutions of the receiving countries can best be organized and related to one another at various levels, although the discussion ranged widely over the field of technical assistance.

Assuming that technical assistance to ameliorate poverty, disease, and ignorance at the level of individual villages can be more effective through multipurpose community development effort than through separate specialized programs, Dr. Grant outlined an ideal type of organization on the basis of his experience in several Asian countries. Planning such an organization would begin with economic and manpower calculations to determine the depth to which technical personnel and facilities could be provided (i.e., how many physicians, hospital beds, agriculturists, teachers, village workers per thousand of population). The last link in the chain of government technicians would be a multipurpose worker responsible for a number of villages. Below this level, development would depend upon local self-help. Approximately twenty multipurpose workers would work out of a development center where there would also be

a specialist from each of the main technical fields. Three or four of these development centers would come under the administration of a self-contained base center whose jurisdiction coincided with a previously existing political or administrative unit of government.

The task of the multipurpose village worker would be to create awareness of need, give advice, and stimulate organization of development councils in each village which might decide upon and carry through actual projects. The specialists at the development center, when called upon by the multipurpose worker, would give advice in their respective fields and give rudimentary training in their fields to at least one person in each village. During the initial period, any previous governmental structure in the area would continue to exist parallel to the development organization. After perhaps three years, the entire administrative machinery below the base center level would be absorbed by the development organization.

Dr. Grant emphasized the importance for a country undertaking community development in many areas of having at least one region maintained at the highest possible level of administrative effectiveness in order to set standards and serve as a center for training additional development workers. Responsibility for such a quality demonstration might be given to a university.

Mr. Warne commented that technical cooperation for rural development in Iran is evolving into a pattern strongly resembling the one suggested by Dr. Grant. Joint U.S.-Iranian technical cooperation teams are based at the state level, which is the lowest level at which the Iranian ministries had field services. Each state now has a few trained village workers, who are simultaneously engaged in training additional workers so that all the villages can be reached and stimulating project requests which will bring the specialists from the state level out into the villages.

Mr. Demuth pointed out that concern with "coordinating technical assistance" is frequently misdirected. The real goal is usually economic development, to which end technical assistance must be coordinated with public and private investment and other governmental activities. Although community devel-

opment work is almost always beneficial, there are other kinds of technical assistance which often have the effect of creating interest in numerous ambitious development schemes far beyond the capacity of the government to finance or administer. An early need in all countries is for some sort of central programming institution which can take up the question of priorities. For this purpose it is important to have a responsible institution close to the center of governmental authority. Economic planning by citizen councils or other bodies not in the main stream of responsibility is seldom effective in the long run.

Mr. van Mook stressed the importance for economic development of improving public administration in all fields of government. Although there is usually superficial agreement that administrative improvement is needed, this agreement frequently breaks down when specific proposals for improvement conflict with other short-run interests. In many underdeveloped countries there is need for a completely new concept of public offices, stressing responsibility and service. This is one of the reasons why training and other devices by which the points of view of young officials may be broadened are emphasized in the United Nations program.

Mr. Corcoran suggested that although the United States agencies giving technical assistance formally recognize the importance of administrative improvement in recipient countries, the actual programming of economic and technical aid does not place sufficient emphasis upon it. Furthermore, it is difficult for the United States to recommend that other countries improve their administration when its own agencies giving technical assistance have been unable to solve their own administrative problems. Rapid turnover of personnel, uncertain division of authority between Washington and the field, and a fragmented authority over programming at headquarters are continuing problems. Although there is an announced policy of devolving responsibility for certain aspects of technical assistance upon private firms and nongovernmental organizations, there are a number of implications of this policy which evidently have not been faced, and the policy itself has not been vigorously followed through.

Mr. Warne thought that there had been considerable improvement on many of these points in the past few months. The chairman observed that perhaps some of these problems are inherent in the difficulty of the subject matter.

The closing discussion, with members of the audience participating, revolved around three propositions: (1) although one can never be certain what will happen when social change is deliberately stimulated, there should be an attempt at planning which can anticipate the most important ramifications of any proposed course; (2) it is essential that government officials at all levels in underdeveloped countries have an attitude of social responsibility and enthusiasm for economic development; and (3) the emergency atmosphere still surrounding technical assistance should give way to a permanent long-term program with stable personnel dedicated to careers in such activity.

Research in Communications and Decision-Making

Chairman—Harvey C. Mansfield, Professor of Political Science, Ohio State University

Panel—Eugene Jacobson, Assistant Program Director, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; Everett W. Reimer, Director, Washington Research Office, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University; Herbert A. Simon, Head, Department of Industrial Management, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Commentators—James W. Fesler, Professor of Political Science, Yale University; Paul N. Ylvisaker, Associate Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College

Rapporteur—R. Vance Presthus, Associate Professor of Political Science, Michigan State College

Panel members discussed three on-going research projects, with particular emphasis upon method and tentative conclusions.

Simon's study, which involved seven industrial firms and their plants, aimed to determine how alterations in organizational arrangements of the accounting department affect the

flow and the impact of accounting information on other staff and operating units. The data were notes of interviews with staff and operating workers, rather than direct observations. The analysis sought two things. First, a look at the role of information from the operating end: What kinds of decisions had to be made and where? What kinds of information were required to make them? Second, the patterns discernible in the actual flow of information: Who talked to whom? Here, considerable "detective" work was required when X and Y disagreed on their communication relationships. This same methodological problem was encountered in one of the other studies.

Three kinds of accounting information were found to be used in arriving at decisions: (1) "scorecard," or how-are-we-doing, types of records, such as those measuring output and expense; (2) attention-directing signals, such as quarterly budget statements which would indicate current financial condition; and (3) problem-solving data necessary for decisional premises, such as comparative cost figures which would enable one to choose between two pieces of equipment. The first two needs are covered by periodic routine procedures; for the third no routine data-gathering system suffices because decisions are nonrecurrent. Thus specialists within accounting departments, free from routine tasks, are needed for assignment to secure problem-solving information.

Communications between accounting and operating people are complicated by the vexing problem of language. The need to bring these groups together seems to justify even make-work projects or staff conferences solely as stratagems to overcome functional barriers. The lack of unity of command ordinarily was not a problem. The factory accountant did not care where his orders came from, since there was a clear line between technical information from his accounting superior and the orders of his plant manager. The location of command was important, however, in cases where the organization was trying to reverse past practice and promote the acceptance and use of accounting information by operating people. There, it was necessary to attach the accountant to his functional superior.

Reimer's report involved the installation of an experiment in a "large financial concern"

with a strict hierarchical form of organization and dealt with the relation of hierarchy to communication and decision-making. The research design was installed in the corporation by establishing "equal status" planning groups who operated in an informal face-to-face relationship. Observers maintained written records of the decision-making meetings, but the planning phase of the experiment was not rigorously controlled otherwise.

Certain advantages in communication and decision-making were observed in the equal-status group. Attitudes, freed from deference to status, were found to shift freely, to an extent which proved surprising to participants. An initially negative attitude toward the experiment gradually became positive and participative. Self-insight was enhanced as to reasons both for holding particular views and for changing them. A substantial increase in personal rapport between individuals seemed to occur. At the same time, some liabilities were apparent. Frustration due to the delays of committee procedure was great. It proved impossible, moreover, to reach decisions within the equal-status groups where major differences of interest, power, and point of view between high and low status people and subgroups existed.

Conclusions were (1) that hierarchy inhibits both the amount and the variety of communication; (2) that hierarchy acts as a filter which progressively restricts the amount of information passed along and also seeks to insure that what is communicated has *official* sanction; and (3) that the group system of decision-making is superior in long-range policy matters, but is weak in regard to operating decisions and interpretations of policy. The group method is most deficient in making *judicial* decisions which involve sanctions against groups or individuals present or represented.

Jacobson's study was a "one-time," face-to-face, cross-section analysis of a public agency, using interviews and fairly complex sociometric techniques to compute and present findings. Essentially, the study was concerned with interpersonal contacts and their impact on decision-making: Who were the people most likely to influence decisions through personal contacts? Two hundred professional workers in scientific and administrative posts were in-

terviewed and asked to fill out forms indicating the persons with whom they had working contacts, as well as the frequency, the reasons for, and the importance of such contacts. Whether or not the contacts were voluntary or required was also noted. Workers were provided a five-point continuum in order to report "importance" and "frequency." "Reciprocated" contacts, i.e., contacts which *both* persons concerned said occurred, were analyzed extensively. The analysis indicated that a number of individuals reported many contacts which were in fact unreciprocated, if not imaginary.

IBM was used to determine the whole pattern of personal contacts. When refined, this "matrix of reciprocated contacts" revealed twenty-five subgroups that included individuals most likely to influence each other's decision-making through interpersonal contact. Thus the difference between formal and actual communication patterns was systematically analyzed and portrayed.

In general, the agency concerned had a rather informal model of decision and communication. However, it was found that the Administrative Bureau tended toward a well-defined pattern of contacts following formal lines, while personal contacts in the Scientific Bureau were generally less limited to organization chart relationships. In addition, certain individuals were found who operated *outside* of the contact groups. They seemed to play a vital liaison role, made possible by the certain personality skills, or made necessary by the inadequacy of the formal communication system. Finally, it appeared that positive employee attitudes toward the agency and their satisfactions with regard to participation in decision-making were related to the number and kind of interpersonal contacts made.

In the discussion period, comments ranged between fascination with the visual aids used to portray the intricacies of Jacobson's sociometric results and skepticism of the significance of conclusions drawn from data so restricted as to permit exact measurement.

Headquarters—Field Relations

Chairman—B. Frank White, Regional Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Dallas

Panel—Jack B. Collins, Director of Federal Contributions, Federal Civil Defense Administration; Joseph A. Connor, Regional Director, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Chicago; James W. Fesler, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Yale University; Albert H. Rosenthal, Regional Director, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Denver

Rapporteur—David C. Knapp, Assistant Professor of Government, University of New Hampshire

By way of introduction to the subject of relations between headquarters offices and field organizations, the members of the panel sought to formulate a general rationale for a field organization. They agreed that the establishment of a field organization satisfies at least four organizational needs: (1) the need to delegate authority geographically and to acknowledge that the major part of administrative operations is in the field; (2) the need to provide headquarters offices with a channel for communicating attitudes of agency clientele toward administrative policies; (3) the need for recognition of regional differences in the administration of programs; and (4) the need to provide adequate service to clientele.

The panel then sought to identify the more critical problem areas of headquarters-field relations and to analyze some of the divergent points of view in these areas.

The panel discussed two aspects of the problem of organizational clarity: the delegation of authority and the role of technical supervision in headquarters-field relations. In considering the first problem, the panel was concerned primarily with the breadth of responsibility which should be assigned and the authority which should be delegated to the field organization. Mr. Collins suggested that an evolutionary approach might be used to advantage, the breadth and degree of delegated authority increasing as the organization gained in maturity and in proved trustworthiness. Several members of the panel questioned the wisdom of this approach on the grounds that it (1) encouraged the growth of vested organizational interests; (2) prevented the development of strong executive leadership and initiative in the field; (3) hindered the develop-

ment of positive recruitment; and (4) did not properly take into account the differing needs of various agencies.

Mr. Rosenthal suggested that in considering how much and what kind of authority should be delegated to the field, recognition be given to the fact that real authority rests less upon broad formal delegations than upon the myriad of decisions, such as budget allocation and employment powers, in which field administrators might be granted discretion. Mr. Rosenthal and Mr. Connor also pointed out that the scope of authority granted to field personnel may depend upon the leadership qualities of administrators, personality characteristics of those responsible for delegation, and the confidence of agency administrators in their field personnel.

The allotment of areas of responsibility among technical and administrative personnel in field organization is one of the most difficult problems in headquarters-field relations. The question of dual supervision, "the dotted-single line controversy," probably has no single solution, as there are differences among agencies in the degree to which technical field organization can be integrated under general supervision. Mr. Fesler pointed out that there are distinct reasons for differing types of supervision in single- and multi-functional organizations and that there would conceivably be many shadings within one organization. To some extent conflicts between technical and general supervision may be solved by cooperative effort, rather than by laying down specific principles of delegation based upon hypothetical situations which will not arise.

An analysis of the relative roles of national and field offices in the supervision of technical personnel points up the problem of dual supervision. It is essential to balance the need for strong technical supervision and the subordination of all technical personnel directly to general administrators. While it must be recognized that there is need for technical control and supervision of operations from a national headquarters, it should also be recognized that agencies must be concerned with the total, articulated impact of their programs in each area.

In discussing a second major problem, mem-

bers of the panel concluded that there is frequently lack of clarity in internal communication between headquarters and the field. Too much is attempted by written communication, too little by oral communication and group conferences. The problem is intensified by a lack of cross-fertilization between the two levels of administration and a lack of appreciation in many headquarters offices of the time lag which must ensue between the issuance of written directives and their implementation in the field.

Members of the panel presented differing views concerning the usefulness of a director of field operations in improving internal communications. While several members considered such a position desirable in the early stages of organizational development as a means of providing stability and equity, others felt that it was dangerous to make generalizations. A headquarters director of field operations might, for example, be more useful in a multi-functional than a single-purpose agency. Mr. Fesler suggested that the position might readily lower the status of regional officials and tend to become simply a procedures office, rather than one concerned with the coordination of the substance of programs. It was generally agreed that such a position should be attached to the office of the agency administrator and should not be given independent organizational status.

While agreeing with Mr. White that structural arrangements which might hinder the integration of headquarters-field activities should be avoided, Mr. Collins suggested that some degree of conflict between a client-oriented field organization and a nationally-oriented headquarters organization was not necessarily a hindrance to administration.

The third critical area discussed by the panel was the "evaluation of people" and the "appraisal of things." Members of the panel agreed that too much time is spent upon a detailed audit of property and procedures, and that program evaluation in terms of the achievement of program objectives and the executive skill of regional offices is almost totally absent. Headquarters offices should place greater emphasis upon evaluating executive leadership and program relationships

when appraising the operation of field organizations.

In conclusion, Mr. White suggested that more consideration should be given to an analysis of the rationale of field organizations. He stressed the need for recognizing the dissimilar needs of agencies in headquarters-field relations and the desirability of a critical appraisal of the objectives of field organizations.

Program Planning

Chairman—Charles S. Ascher, Associate Director, Public Administration Clearing House, New York

Panel—Lyle E. Craine, Department of Natural Resources, University of Michigan; Murray R. Nathan, Director, Office of Planning and Procedures, New York State Department of Health; Herbert H. Rosenberg, Science Program Analyst, National Science Foundation; Norman Wengert, Chairman, Department of Social Science, North Dakota Agricultural College

Rapporteur—Robert J. M. Matteson, Director of Training, Institute of Public Administration

The meeting dealt with two main subjects. First, and more important, it took up the procedures and processes involved in making plans of work. Second, it gave attention to the organizational arrangements for work planning. A distinction was drawn between program planning and budgeting; the former focuses on activities and the latter on finances. Mr. Ascher suggested that the session might well take as its text a quotation from Luther Gulick's *Administrative Reflections from World War II*: "Translation from purpose to program is the crucial step in administration."

The discussion of planning procedures and processes was conducted through analyzing one by one the different phases of plan development. To guide the analysis, the panel followed in a general way a list of planning steps recently formulated by the Washington Chapter of the Society for the Advancement of Management. The discussants also referred from time to time to a somewhat similar list drawn up in the 1930's by Harlow S. Person and (from the personal experience of three of

the panel members) to the work of the now disbanded Program Staff of the United States Department of the Interior. This summary can best proceed, as did the panel, by grouping the main points of the discussion around several items on the SAM list.

1. **Determination of Needs and Resources.** Several speakers supported the thesis that this step is necessary before realistic objectives can be established. Mr. Nathan indicated that research, public opinion, and gubernatorial directives are among the factors considered by his agency in deciding whether various projects ought to be undertaken. Mr. Rosenberg described how electronic calculators are used in the analysis of military requirements.

2. **Definition of Goals, Purposes, and Objectives.** Mr. Wengert noted that program planners have found that many older agencies do not ordinarily attempt to analyze or rationalize their activities in terms of basic goals. Several individuals stressed the importance of understanding what assumptions as to outside circumstances, changes over time, and other factors underlie program objectives. The element of uncertainty conditions the definition of goals as well as all other phases of the planning process.

3. **Identification of Strategic Factors.** According to Mr. Craine, this step involves decisions on the main avenues along which certain program ends can best be attained. These decisions have to be made with an eye to public opinion, political considerations, and the needs of other programs as to what will be most effective in the context of a single undertaking. Mr. Ascher pointed out that timing is a crucial element in the selection of strategic factors.

4. **Selection of Means Toward Goals.** This step was defined as encompassing the decisions on the specific methods and the specific resources of men, matériel, and money to be used in working along the chosen avenues toward program objectives. As examples of different "means" in one field, Mr. Nathan noted that public health goals are variously furthered by (a) disease prevention, (b) case finding, (c) treatment, and (d) rehabilitation. Mr. Rosenberg made the point that "safety margins" are considered in all military calculations to determine the means for plan execution.

5. **Integration of Parts and Whole.** Mr. Craine said that the central focus of the Program Staff in the Department of the Interior had been on this step. According to Mr. Wengert, Interior found that operational integration of all departmental activities could not be achieved successfully in the Office of the Secretary. Better results were forthcoming from coordination in the field, through use of regional centers of the department and in other ways.

The panel touched more briefly on the other four steps in planning as listed by the SAM. These are (a) establishing priorities, (b) securing funds, (c) scheduling and controlling accomplishment, and (d) evaluation. Mr. Wengert indicated his belief that the planning process for governmental programs is weakest in the first two points and suggested the preparation of alternate budgets as a way of adjusting to appropriation cuts in a logical, balanced fashion. It was noted, on the other hand, that work scheduling and control is one of the areas in which program planning has been relatively strong.

The discussion of the organization of planning focused chiefly on the question of where planning fits into the general administrative structure of governmental agencies. Gordon Clapp, chairman of the board, Tennessee Valley Authority, commented that planning in TVA is done throughout the agency rather than in a particular specialized unit. This contrasts in some measure with the situation in the New York State Department of Health where Mr. Nathan heads an office whose function is the coordination of operational plans. Mr. Ascher, in his former work as program officer of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), had similar coordinative responsibilities.

Several other comments dealt also with this question. As one point, reliance on special commissions for planning purposes was criticized on the grounds that the work of these groups is usually not well integrated with the know-how and objectives of the permanent operating agencies. In similar vein, the relationship between program staff and budget staff was identified as a crucial factor in determining the effectiveness of planning. A general matter at issue in a number of questions and answers was

whether a chief executive should rely heavily on a central planning group in securing coordination and plotting directions, or should instead look on these functions as major personal responsibilities.

Two fundamental questions, related particularly to this last point, ran like threads through the discussion of both planning process and planning organization. First, is program planning really a clearly recognizable separate function of administration, i.e. separate—and if necessary separable—from program execution? Second, how can scientific program planning, with its careful weighing of alternative ends and means, be reconciled with the often seemingly irrational vagaries of politics?

Intergovernmental Relations

Chairman—John M. Gaus, Professor of Government, Harvard University

Panel—George C. S. Benson, Research Director, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; Carl H. Chatters, Executive Director, American Municipal Association; Loula F. Dunn, Director, American Public Welfare Association; George F. Gant, Consultant for Graduate Programs, Southern Regional Education Board; Joseph E. McLean, Associate Professor of Public Affairs, Princeton University; Frank C. Moore, President, Government Affairs Foundation, Inc.

Rapporteur—Rosalind G. Baldwin, Director of Research, Government Affairs Foundation, Inc.

The chairman outlined the panel's assignment as the presentation of different but related interpretations of our evolving federal system as it affects relations among the different levels of government.

Mr. Benson described the research program of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, as planned to date. It consists of a study in twelve sample states of the impact of federal aid programs; surveys by committees on intergovernmental relations on functional bases; studies of financial aspects of intergovernmental relations by the commission staff; and special studies of specific problems.

Fundamental questions facing the commission include: What kind of state and local gov-

ernments do we want in the United States? Should they have any functions completely to themselves, and, if so, which functions? Is the doctrine of separation of levels of government outdated? Are state and local governments obsolete?

What is the purpose of injecting the federal government into various intergovernmental activities? If to stimulate needed services, when should stimulation cease? If to equalize economic inequalities, has that goal been reached or approached?

Is the federal government distributing grants on a responsible basis, after considering the needs of all citizens? Might it be better to give funds for general support of the states—or only to the poorer states? Should federal grants "equalize" among the states, and, if so, what should be used to measure needs and resources?

Should the federal government protect its grants from influence by pressure groups at the state and local levels, or, for that matter, from control by unrepresentative state legislatures?

Should the federal government act to improve state-local relations?

If focus of responsibility leads to better administration, why is it good to have aid programs which diffuse responsibility?

Are state governors likely to become officers elected primarily to preside over the distribution of funds, the amount of which has been determined at Washington?

In parts of the commission's program, progress awaits appointment of a chairman and allocation of further funds.

Mr. McLean commented that in the rise of functionalism, specialists in particular services have played a major role. United and vociferous, specialists hold a strong position in contrast to the generalists and the people.

Slogans for "giving powers back to the states and localities" as a means of "bringing government closer to the people" imply that there is no such thing as national self-government. In Mr. McLean's view, before turning anything back to the states, something must be done about the lack of representativeness and lack of responsibility of state legislatures. While his office has been strengthened recently in some states, the governor, whose views presumably have been endorsed by the people,

frequently cannot accomplish his program because of the power of functional groups and an unrepresentative legislature.

Despite the mixed-up character of the federal system in the United States today, even with its professional power groups, it is preferable to too much power in the hands of unrepresentative state legislatures.

Miss Dunn discussed the increase in numbers of professional workers in government and the growing scope of their activity. The principal problem for the professional worker in government today is to find a middle ground between responsibility to his profession and responsibility to the total governmental unit. Multiplicity of federal and state laws, regulations, and grants make it difficult for the professional worker to see himself as a part of total governmental service. But if he fails to maintain that perspective, he becomes ineffectual.

Experience under the Social Security Act has made a significant contribution to national public policy and to public administration. The merit system requirement has given great impetus to merit selection of professional workers at all levels of government. Not all parts of the Social Security Act have worked out so happily. The requirement for withholding all funds from a state where one political subdivision fails to operate the program seems harsh, but it has stimulated expansion and improvement of services.

Mr. Moore sees the state as the middleman in federal-state-local relationships. The impact of federal decisions is so great that state fiscal policy cannot be formulated without an understanding of federal affairs.

Within a state, the localities and the state serve the same people and draw on the same resources. The state is responsible for seeing that its minor units have adequate resources for financing necessary services. This unique position of the state is a vital and useful feature of our governmental system, since only the state is in a position to make the necessary evaluations from an over-all point of view.

Mr. Moore asked: Can the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, within a reasonable time, analyze and appraise the permutations and combinations of relationships between the states and their localities? Perhaps

the job of the commission should be primarily federal-state, with some generalized recommendations on apportionment of functions and finances between state and local governments.

The states might perform a useful role by initiating studies of intergovernmental relations similar to that of the New York state Temporary Commission on the Fiscal Affairs of State Government headed by Frederick L. Bird. In any state, however, the solution of state-local problems will require the full interest, know-how, and support of local officials.

Mr. Chatters remarked that what government is and what it does are affected by every social, economic, and political force which affects our lives generally. The most important problems of intergovernmental relations are at the local level, but local problems must be solved within the framework of state and federal laws. Local fiscal difficulties today have resulted largely from policies of the federal and state governments adopted mostly through necessity.

The states, in their key position, should take greater interest in relationships among minor units and also should intercede for cities in their dealings with the federal government. Local professional workers concerned with particular functions should harmonize their special interests with other interests at the local level.

The clock cannot be turned back by returning everything to the states and localities, Mr. Chatters said. The federal government now has a parallel interest in some activities which previously were of purely state and local concern.

While the quality of proposed improvements in intergovernmental relations will depend on the technicians, administrators, and specialists, getting improvements into effect will require political leadership and political action—a fact we are too prone to overlook.

Metropolitan areas have not progressed on their problems because there is no agency through which the people of the area can act. Necessary action, when taken, will come primarily at the state and local levels. People at the local level must get together and work with the states more intelligently and forcefully.

To study allocation of functions among the

several levels of government is important, but the real problem is the development of constructive relationships among the levels, said Mr. Gant. People are more concerned about getting things done than about the level of government which should do them.

The interstate compact or agreement, to which the federal government may be a party, provides a workable alternative to complete allocation of a function to the states or federal government.

Interstate compacts or agreements have been adapted to numerous activities in recent years. In Mr. Gant's view, they are not most effective where a real problem exists and where they provide a definite mechanism for doing the job. Through such compacts, several levels of government may participate in a dignified and equal capacity in solving problems of mutual concern.

The Southern Regional Education Board was created by fourteen states to strengthen graduate and professional education in their area, where the numbers of students did not warrant those facilities in every state or educational institution. The board has no jurisdiction over any institution or state. It transmits recommendations to state advisory councils who, in turn, discuss them with representatives of education, budget authorities, legislatures, and governors. Important recommendations developed by competent people for action on significant problems will receive attention.

In the discussion period, Mr. Benson indicated agreement with Mr. Moore that the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations could not make a detailed study of state-local relations but, through a special committee, will consider state-local relations as they are affected by federal-state relations—which effects are very substantial.

Mr. Gaus pointed out that problems being discussed are not peculiar to federal systems, but characteristic of industrial urban interdependent societies even in unitary states. He inquired whether the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations plans to study governmental interrelationships in other countries, including some which do not have federal systems.

Mr. Benson said the commission has side-tracked studies of other federal systems because of restrictions of time and money.

In response to a question about the probable effect of the program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Mr. Benson said he does not know what the commission will recommend but that, at his suggestion, the commission staff are thinking in terms of an ideal program which could be worked toward over a period of a good many years, whereas the Health, Education, and Welfare program probably is a next step in a trend which the department has in mind. The commission's recommendations would be more general.

In response to a question about how to reconcile grants-in-aid with home rule, Mr. Chatters said the answer depends on what you mean by home rule—complete independence or the right to decide certain matters within the framework provided by the state and the nation. It should include at least the right of a city to draw its own charter and to choose its own officers. But it does not mean that the state constitution must segregate functions between the state and the city and that the two will never become mixed up.

It was the consensus of the session that the discussion had accurately pictured the present situation as confused, and that something should be done about the confusion.

Contemporary Topics

Compiled by Public Administration Clearing House

New Personnel Advisory Group

The Civil Service Commission has established an Interagency Advisory Group, composed of personnel directors of all Cabinet departments and certain major independent agencies, with intermittent participation by personnel directors of the smaller agencies, to provide a means for consultation between agencies and the commission on personnel policies and practices.

To insure the effectiveness of the group, membership is limited to directors of personnel or to persons who can act fully in their absence. Membership from the smaller agencies is limited to five, but this group will be changed every six months.

Agencies having permanent membership include: the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Air Force, Army, Navy, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Justice, Labor, Post Office, State, and Treasury; also the Bureau of the Budget, D. C. Government, Foreign Operations Administration, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of Defense Mobilization, United States Information Agency, Veterans' Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, General Accounting Office, Government Printing Office, Library of Congress, and Tennessee Valley Authority.

Under a charter adopted by the group, regular meetings are held once a month. Special meetings may be called by the executive director of the commission, John W. Macy, Jr., who is chairman of the group.

Project committees made up of personnel directors or other members of their staffs or agencies and chaired by Civil Service Commission representatives will be formed from time to time to study and report on specific issues or proposals that require research or development. Reports may be made through the over-

all group or directly to the executive director of the commission, as the occasion warrants.

Executive vice chairman of the organization and director of its small staff is O. Glenn Stahl, formerly executive vice chairman of the Federal Personnel Council. The council was abolished July 31, 1953, in compliance with a provision of the Independent Offices Act of 1954.

Regional directors of the commission have been asked to set up in their areas, where practical, organizations similar to the central Interagency Advisory Group. These groups will be concerned primarily with local personnel matters. However, they may also be called upon to assist the Washington organization in gathering data, making trial runs, or giving points of view in connection with national projects that it initiates.

Stockberger Award

The sixth annual Warner W. Stockberger Achievement Award in Personnel Administration went to T. Roy Reid, director of personnel in the U. S. Department of Agriculture from 1941 until his recent appointment as director of the Department's Graduate School.

Mr. Reid is generally credited with sponsoring and supporting much progressive personnel policy and legislation. Legislation identified as having received his strong support and personal assistance in drafting includes the medical service program for departmental and field offices of the federal government and the program to provide incentives and awards for employees. When Congress enacted the incentives and awards legislation, Mr. Reid's office had a pilot program ready for installation. Both of these department programs have served as models for other agencies under federal and state jurisdiction.

Prior to his appointment as director of the Department of Agriculture Graduate School,

Mr. Reid had served as chairman of the School's General Administration Board and had helped initiate a number of experimental programs, including a series of conferences on public administration and the training programs for field personnel established in cooperation with Boston University and New York University.

Science and Government

An Executive order issued by the President on March 17 directs the National Science Foundation to make studies of the scientific activities of the nation and to recommend to the President policies to strengthen the research effort and define the federal government's role in it. The foundation, over a period of time, is expected to become increasingly responsible for providing federal support for basic research carried on in universities and other nonprofit institutions, although other federal agencies will continue to carry on basic research which is closely related to their statutory missions.

The foundation will also study the effects of federal research support on the nation's educational institutions and recommend policies and procedures to promote the attainment of the federal research objectives while safeguarding the strength and independence of the educational institutions.

The order directs the head of each agency engaged in research to make sure that its research programs reflect urgent needs and are carried on economically and with regard to the efficient use of scientific manpower. In this connection the order provides a new method to facilitate the exchange of scientific equipment and facilities among federal agencies so as to avoid buying new equipment or building new facilities when another agency has unused equipment or facilities available.

An Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research is directed to "ensure that each Federal agency engaged directly in scientific research is kept informed of selected major equipment and facilities which could serve the needs of more than one agency" and each agency possessing such equipment and facilities is to be responsible for maintaining appropriate records to assist other agencies in arranging for their joint use or exchange.

Federal Grants-in-Aid

State and local interest in the administration of federal grant-in-aid programs has been stimulated by the establishment, in July, 1953, of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The commission was directed to make a nationwide study of all the activities in which federal aid is extended to state and local governments and to determine, among other things, whether there is justification for such federal aid and whether there is need for federal aid in other fields.

Broad-scale studies are being made in a large number of states by "little commissions" established at the suggestion of the main commission. These studies are being carried on in conformance with a general pattern indicated by the main commission so as to insure comparability of the data assembled. The commission has also contracted with management consulting firms for "impact studies" in a number of states to determine the composite impact of all federal aid programs in the state and local fields where the service is rendered. These studies are being made in Connecticut, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, South Carolina, Washington, and Wyoming. Similar studies have been initiated under various auspices in California, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

Federal-State Relations in Quebec

A Royal Commission, set up by the Quebec provincial government to study and investigate federal-provincial relations in the province, held its first meeting in November. Thomas Tremblay, chief judge of the Quebec City Court of Sessions, is chairman of the six-man commission which has been holding hearings at several points in the province.

Before the commission for investigation is the operation of the present tax rental agreements which are in effect between the dominion and all provinces of Canada except Quebec. The Quebec Chamber of Commerce, which recommended the creation of the present commission, stated in a brief submitted at the hearing that the provinces and municipalities no longer have the required freedom of action to meet their governmental needs because of the relatively high proportion of national revenues collected by the dominion government.

Government User Charges

The Congress is apparently of two minds about imposing fees or other charges on the public for services primarily of direct benefit to limited numbers of individuals or groups.

This subject received a good deal of attention during 1951 and 1952. The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made a sample study covering twelve agencies and issued a report, *Fees for Special Services* (Sen. Rep. 2120, 81st Cong.). The House Ways and Means Committee passed a resolution near the end of the same session requesting the Bureau of the Budget to make a survey of all existing systems of fees and charges to serve as a basis for further study of their adequacy. And the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1952 included a section (Title V) which expressed the intent of Congress that government services of this type should be made self-sustaining through the charging of appropriate fees.

Replies received by the Bureau of the Budget to its questionnaire, sent to the heads of all executive departments and establishments pursuant to the request of the House Ways and Means Committee, indicated that the practice of charging for these special services was on the increase. In a report to the committee early in 1952 the bureau enumerated more than eighty-five fields in which fees had been instituted or increased during the fiscal year 1951. The report also enumerated about fifty types of special services where fees were nonexistent or inadequate but could not be charged except by congressional action.

The bureau has continued its research on this subject and has issued a series of circulars to all agencies of the executive branch establishing standards for charges to be made in the fields of licensing, copying, and mapping. Where the collection of a fee for such services is prohibited by statute or Executive order, or where a statute or Executive order requires the fee to be lower than that required by the Budget Bureau circular, the agency concerned is asked to submit to the bureau a draft of legislation or Executive order that will permit the fixing of the fees required by the circular.

The House Appropriations Committee, in its report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1954, directed the Army to

implement the terms of Title V and mentioned that it was particularly desirable in connection with the issuance of duplicates of discharge certificates. Testimony before the committee indicated that approximately 200,000 such duplicates were issued in the course of a year, and that a fairly substantial number of employees were engaged in providing the service.

All of these actions indicate acceptance of the idea that payment should generally be made by the public for these special services. However, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce announced on March 30 unanimous approval of a committee resolution stating that "it is the sense of the committee that the Department of Commerce and any agency, commission, or bureau thereof, the CAB, the Coast Guard, the FTC, the FPC, and the ICC, respectively, should suspend until July 1, 1955, any pending or proposed proceeding involving the imposition of fees and charges pursuant to title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, or Circular No. A-25 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated November 5, 1953." (100 Cong. Rec. D341, March 30, 1954).

Although a committee resolution of this sort is not acted upon by the Congress and does not have the force of legislation, the fact that the committee passes on substantive legislation affecting all of the agencies named in the resolution will obviously influence their action.

National Security Resources Board History

The Executive Office of the President has issued a volume of administrative history entitled *A Case Study in Peacetime Mobilization Planning*. Completed while the Congress still had under consideration Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953 establishing the Office of Defense Mobilization in the Executive Office of the President and transferring to it the functions of the National Security Resources Board, the report brings up to date on an unclassified basis an earlier classified report which had been prepared for the chairman of the NSRB, entitled *Readiness for Mobilization: A Report on the Role and Activities of the National Security Resources Board, 1947-1952*. The author's foreword suggests that the history of the board demonstrates the failure of the basic

concept of a presidential staff divorced from operations for effective mobilization planning.

The study is divided into two parts. Part I is an analysis of the organization and role of the NSRB with particular attention to the problems encountered in its unique composition, in recognizing and carrying out its presidential staff mission, in planning and developing its program, and in establishing effective working relationships with the departments and agencies of the federal government. It includes a section on contractual arrangements with nongovernmental agencies and the use of advisory committees and groups. It concludes with a summary of the events leading up to the consolidation of the NSRB and the ODM.

Part II is a concise presentation of NSRB's programs and accomplishments in the major areas of its responsibility to the extent that security considerations permit.

Copies of this study are not for sale through the Government Printing Office and distribution is being limited as much as possible to university and agency libraries. Requests for copies should be addressed to the Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington 25, D. C.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office

J. R. Simpson, formerly chief of the Organization and Methods Division of H. M. Treasury and a member of the Committee on Administrative Practices of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences, has recently been appointed controller of H. M. Stationery Office. P. S. Milner-Barry has been appointed to succeed Mr. Simpson as chief of the O & M Division.

H. M. S. O., which has responsibility for activities roughly comparable with those of the U.S. Government Printing Office, employs some 7,500 people; runs eight printing establishments, including one which prints *Hansard*; supplies stationery to the Prime Minister and the Palace; prints most telephone directories, all national savings and insurance stamps and meteorological base maps, and the oldest newspaper in Great Britain—the *London Gazette*; and produces best-sellers, such as *Battle of Britain*, which sold over 4,000,000 copies.

The Stationery Office has been responsible since 1951 for insuring adequate and effective reproduction service throughout government

departments, which includes the provision of a central service for those departments whose needs do not justify the maintenance of their own service or of staff and equipment to carry peak loads of work.

Public Works Survey

Specifications are well advanced for nearly \$5 billion to be spent on public improvements during the next five years by 141 municipalities who replied in a survey conducted by a number of "1313" organizations at the request of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. A three-page questionnaire, prepared jointly by the American Municipal Association, the American Public Works Association, the American Society of Planning Officials, the International City Managers' Association, and the Municipal Finance Officers Association, was mailed to 334 cities, including all cities over 100,000 population and a selected sample of cities from 10,000 to 100,000 population.

Although this was intended only as a sample study and full answers to all questions were not received, the study is believed to be one of the most comprehensive undertaken in recent years on the subject.

About 36 per cent of the total amount reported as budgeted for capital improvements during the next five years is represented in definite plans and specifications that are 50 per cent or more complete. The backlog of such plans is growing for most municipalities—an indication that much of the pent-up demand for municipal improvements still remains to be met.

Plans are most advanced for city streets and roads; plans for storm and sanitary sewers come next. Other municipal improvements for which the backlog is increasing are water and other utility facilities, schools and libraries, and general municipal buildings such as fire and police stations and city halls.

Other conclusions reached after a study of the answers received from the reporting cities are: (1) municipalities have enough borrowing margin for their planned improvement program; (2) a growing number of cities favor a full or partial pay-as-you-go policy for financing improvements; (3) most cities already own or control the land needed for planned programs; (4) about four out of five of the cities

reporting believe that some changes would be required in state and local legislation if their public improvement programs were to be expanded or speeded up; and (5) the cities do not see tax and debt limits as being as great a block to planned construction as other factors, such as the desire to protect the city's credit standing, reluctance to impose new taxes, and difficulties in getting bond approvals at local referendums.

Local Government Structure

The Bureau of the Census, in connection with its 1952 census of governmental units in the United States, completed an intensive review of its definitions and criteria relating to state and local government establishments, examined all existing state legislation governing the nature and establishment of units of local government, and identified, classified, and counted all units of local government then in active existence. The statistical results of that work appear in tabular form in the Census publication, *Governments in the United States in 1952*, which was issued about a year ago.

A second report, issued in March, 1954, entitled *Local Government Structure in the United States*, provides a summary textual description of the various types of local governments authorized to exist in each of the forty-eight states and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, as of June, 1952. Governmental units identified include counties, municipalities, townships, school districts, and special districts. In addition, each state section of the report lists various statutory authorities, districts, and other forms of organization that may have certain characteristics of independent governments but which appear so subject by law to administrative or financial control by the state or by other local governments that they have been classified by the Census Bureau as subordinate agencies. Also listed in the various state sections are certain geographical subdivisions or areas established by law for administrative purposes that bear designations which might appear to relate to separate governmental units. The report includes several pages of introductory material which explain the definitions and criteria used by the Census Bureau in identifying and classifying the various units of government.

Copies of this report may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C., or at any of the field offices of the U. S. Department of Commerce. Price 50¢.

Career City Managers

The recent appointment of C. A. Harrell as city manager in Cincinnati, Ohio—the largest city operating under the manager plan—emphasizes the career aspects of the city manager profession as it has developed during the last twenty-five years. Mr. Harrell has been a city manager since 1930, when he was promoted from executive assistant to the city manager of Portsmouth, Ohio, to the manager's position. Since then he has been city manager in Binghamton, N. Y.; Schenectady, N. Y.; Norfolk, Virginia; and San Antonio, Texas.

A recent study completed by the International City Managers' Association, based on the personnel records of 801 of its members and on a questionnaire answered by 604 managers, indicates that the average city manager entered the profession between the ages of 30 and 44, coming from another government job. He is a college graduate. He is still serving in his first city. He works 52 hours a week, gets 14 days off a year, and is covered in a retirement system. During his time in office, his pay has increased \$366 a year.

A total of 27 of the 801 managers have been in the profession for 25 years or more, whereas 71 per cent got their first appointments within the last eight years. A total of 66 per cent are still serving their first city. One manager is in his eighth city, two are in their seventh, and one is in his sixth. The remaining 277 managers have served from two to five cities.

Of the 460 managers with college degrees, 19 hold law degrees, 153 have degrees in the arts and sciences, and 198 in some branch of engineering. Ninety have graduate degrees in public or business administration or related fields.

Average yearly salaries range from \$5,596 for cities of less than 5,000 population to \$19,865 for cities of more than 250,000.

More than 1,200 cities and towns were operating under the city manager plan at the end of 1953, and about 250 appointments are made each year. One-third of the appointments involve managers who are promoted from one city to another or former managers who get

new appointments. Nearly one-half of the number come directly from other public administration jobs. Less than one-sixth come from nongovernment positions.

Cornell Executive Development Program

A six-week program of intensive study in the principles, practices, and environment of large-scale modern management will be given at the Executive Development Center at Cornell University from July 19 to August 27, 1954. Director of the program is John J. Corson, head of the Washington division of McKinsey & Company, management consultants, and a visiting professor in the University's School of Business and Public Administration.

The program, which was initiated last year, is designed for reasonably experienced younger executives in business or government whose previous training has been mainly technical and who want help in making the transition from their specialty to general management. Participation in the program is limited to twenty-five persons selected on the basis of applications submitted last April.

The Cornell program emphasizes study of three major areas: (1) general principles of management, including organization, coordination, and human relations; (2) specialized processes of management, including finance, personnel, and industrial relations; and (3) political, economic, and social trends and problems, including business-government relationships which influence the environment of modern management.

In each of these areas emphasis is placed on concepts and data, including case studies, which can best serve the needs of the trained specialist assigned to broader duties. Instruction by seminar method is supplemented by guest lecturers and informal group discussion.

In-Service Training for Housing Inspectors

Cincinnati, Ohio, which like other American cities is adding building and housing inspectors to its staff in stepped-up housing rehabilitation and conservation efforts, has a new program of in-service training for inspectors. To do the job well, Cincinnati had to more than double its regular field force of seven men. The methods used to train ten new men are reported in an article by Donald F. Hunter,

Cincinnati's supervising building inspector, in the February issue of the *Journal of Housing*, the monthly magazine of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

In order to recruit men with a good working knowledge of residential construction and building materials, three years of experience in general building construction were specified. Written and oral examinations were given to test intelligence and personal qualifications. Keenness of perception, firmness, tact, good manners and appearance, and good physical condition were required.

The training program was based on the assumption that the recruits knew nothing about tenement districts and what had been done locally and nationally to solve the housing problem. The recruits saw films and slides dealing with the problem and took inspection trips to new housing developments, public and private. They went out by themselves to assigned areas of bad housing and reported back to the group on what they saw. Close attention was given to the mechanics of inspection. The housing and building codes were studied section by section, and their relationships were pointed up.

For two weeks, four hours a day were spent in class work and four in the field. Three months later, a general review of the building code was held. The older inspectors joined these sessions. The review featured lectures by the building commissioner, the assistant commissioner, the senior structural engineer, and the zoning engineer. So successful was the refresher course that the city plans to give at least twenty hours of formal classroom review a year.

Cincinnati credits the training program with improving the skills and attitudes of its seventeen inspectors. In Mr. Hunter's words, "All these men realize that housing work is no longer to be regarded . . . as a tour of duty in the salt mines but instead represents a challenge—an opportunity for service that is unparalleled in public employment."

Visual Aids in Public Management

Visual Aids for the Public Service has been issued by the Public Administration Clearing House as an aid to government officials and others interested in presenting more effectively

the processes of democratic government and improving the techniques for the training of public servants.

The 89-page manual, which is illustrated by more than 150 drawings in color, is the product of a two-year pilot project conducted by Mrs. Rachael Goetz under the auspices of the Clearing House with the cooperation of various associations of public officials—primarily those having headquarters at "1313." The purpose of the project was to bring to the attention of public administrators—who, with some notable exceptions, have tended to make less use of visual aids than industry and the educational institutions—the potential usefulness of films and other media available in their field.

The manual spells out inexpensive uses to which visual aids may be put in the public service. It lists current literature in the field and tells where films, film strips, projectors, and other equipment may be obtained. It also gives tips on the preparation of displays, charts, posters, and other devices, described as part of "a rich collection that can make a real contribution to public employee training and to the taxpayer's understanding of government activities and services."

The manual may be ordered from Public Administration Service, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Price \$3.25.

Administrative Assistants for Mayors

Five cities have made changes in their charters to allow the mayor to appoint an administrator to help him with municipal business, according to the American Municipal Association. The largest are New York, Boston, and Newark, N. J. Smaller cities which have adopted changes are Englewood, N. J., population 23,145, and South Euclid, O., population 15,432. Other large cities under the mayor-council plan that have chief administrative officers appointed by the mayor are Los Angeles, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and New Orleans.

The powers and duties of New York's city administrator include supervision and coordination of all agencies under the mayor except the law department, department of investigation, bureau of the budget, city construction coordinator, and boards, commissions, and authorities. Among the city administrator's re-

sponsibilities are: holding conferences with department heads, preparing annual and other reports, analyzing and reporting to the mayor on forthcoming policy matters that will affect the management of the city, and keeping in touch with civil and community groups.

Boston's City Council created a department of administrative services, headed by a director who serves as chairman of the administrative services board. This board is made up of the city's personnel officer, purchasing agent, auditor, and treasurer. The director also prepares the annual budget which the mayor submits to the council and makes studies and recommendations for the mayor on organization, activities, policies, and procedures of all departments, boards, and officers.

In Newark, a new charter authorizes the mayor to appoint a business administrator who will help in preparing the budget, administer central purchasing and personnel systems, and have some supervisory duties.

A new strong-mayor charter in South Euclid provides for an executive director, appointed by the mayor with the approval of the council. He may serve as head of one or more departments.

In Englewood, the new city business manager holds office at the pleasure of the mayor and council. He is to serve as liaison between the mayor and council and the various departments, boards, and agencies.

Committees and Management

Laboratory research methods are being used at Harvard University in an effort to discover what makes committees perform successfully and what makes them fail. A detailed report on the study, which has been under way for seven years under the direction of Robert F. Bales at Harvard's Laboratory of Social Relations, is carried in *Business Week* for March 20, 1954.

According to this report, the Bales group thinks its most revolutionary finding is that in the course of a number of meetings most committees tend to develop not one, but two leaders. One is the "task leader" who keeps the group working and pushes them along toward the assigned goal. In the process, however, he frequently provokes irritation and breaks up the unity of the group. Unity is restored and

group members are kept happy by a second man, the "social leader," who is usually the best liked member of the committee. Either of these leaders may be the formal chairman, but few people can handle both jobs.

A new phase of the Harvard study is being initiated this spring as the group attempts to determine, through controlled experimentation, whether theories developed out of the seven years of previous research can be applied to set up committees that will be more efficient than those selected on a random basis.

Interest in the use of committees in management has been stimulated by the extensive use being made of advisory committees and other special study groups by the Eisenhower administration. A concise review of the generally accepted ways in which committees may be used effectively is contained in an article by William R. Spriegel and Joseph K. Bailey, "Functions of the Committee: The Real Uses of a Much-Abused Form of Group Operation," which appeared in the December, 1953, issue of *Advanced Management*. (This article, revised to make suggestions applicable to local government, appeared in the March, 1954, issue of *Public Management*, the monthly publication of the International City Managers' Association.) The authors suggest certain procedural factors which should be considered to insure effective committee performance, such as definition of objective, size of committee, selection of members, secretarial and staff aid, and time and frequency of meetings.

The article also emphasizes the fact that the costs of committee work tend to be high, especially when considered in terms of the salary equivalent of the time consumed by the members, and suggests that sound executive action and efficiently conceived organizational structure and administrative practice would obviate the need for many committees.

Carnegie Grant to Case Program

The Carnegie Corporation has approved a grant of \$75,000 to the Inter-University Case Program for the three-year period ending in March, 1957. The Inter-University Case Program, a collaborative undertaking of forty-five colleges and universities, has stimulated the development and use of case studies in policy formation and public administration. To date

the program has published forty-five studies. Twenty-six are included in *Public Administration and Policy Development*, edited by Harold Stein.

Communicating Administrative Terminology

Communications problems stemming from the difficulties encountered in translating and standardizing terms in public administration and the social sciences are being studied in a number of spots around the world.

Benedicto Silva of the Vargas Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, is in charge of a program to collect materials for a Portuguese and Spanish vocabulary in public administration. A committee has been set up which reviews specific words and decides on standard Portuguese and Spanish equivalents for each English technical term.

The Department of Public Administration of the American University in Beirut, under the direction of Fred Bent, is undertaking to compile a glossary of administrative terms in Arabic.

The Division of Public Administration of the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration has been investigating the possibility of preparing an international dictionary in public administration.

In the field of social science, UNESCO is sponsoring research which is directed toward three objectives. One is the compilation of a tentative list of some 100-200 technical terms, with definitions. The aim of this study is to determine the principal difficulties encountered in attempts to standardize terminology and to work out on the basis of experience a program of activities designed to solve them. A second objective is to organize several symposiums, the task of each being to study and define a number of fundamental social science concepts. A thorough analysis of these concepts would throw light on their meaning and use and would in itself make a valuable contribution to social science terminology. A third objective is to prepare a social science dictionary.

Society for Public Administration in the Philippines

A Society for Public Administration of the Philippines was founded on October 24, 1953,

at a meeting attended by a cross-section of government officials in Manila and members of the staff of the Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines. The officers for 1953-54 are: president, Faustino Sy-Changco, Budget Commission; vice president, Ruben Ledesma, Bureau of Civil Service; secretary, Jose V. Abueva, Institute of Public Administration; and treasurer, Dolores T. Yatco, Central Bank. Ferrel Heady, director of the Institute of Public Administration, is adviser to the new society.

Public Administration Training for Underdeveloped Countries

Training programs in public administration are on the increase in universities of underdeveloped countries. At the University of Panama, the Faculty of Public Administration and Commerce has introduced a new basic course in principles of public administration and the techniques of administrative management with the assistance of Robert Avery, public administration adviser of the United States mission in Panama. The faculty is considering strengthening the present curriculum for students of public administration and has set up a short course on administrative management for high-ranking government officials. The University of Malaya is establishing a program for college students planning to enter the public service. Recently a Commission on Higher Education for Africans in Central Africa, chaired by Sir A. M. Carr-Saunders, director of the London School of Economics and Political Science, recommended that a new university be established in Southern Rhodesia and that a department of government and public administration be among the first to be set up.

European universities, too, are expanding training opportunities in public administration for officials and students from underdeveloped countries. During 1953, the 27 public administration fellows from overseas who came to the French National School of Administration included: Brazil, 6; Egypt and Haiti, 3 each; and Afghanistan, Libya, Iran, Israel, Laos, Lebanon, Syria, and Uruguay, 1 each.

At University College of the Southwest of England over 40 students and officials from colonial territories are attending the program

in Public and Social Administration in the academic year 1953-54.

The Institute of Social Studies in The Hague, which is maintained by the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation, is adjusting its program to concentrate on public administration. The plan is to emphasize area studies as well, beginning with the Caribbean and Indonesia. It is expected that the Indonesian area program will attract Westerners who want a country background and Indonesians who want to improve their public administration background.

The institute is narrowing its curriculum because it finds that it cannot assure the supply for the broad offerings in its preliminary catalog. The original mission of the institute was to make Dutch higher education available to foreign students who could not be expected to master the language. The instruction is in English and the program differs from the traditional Dutch lecture system. The institute hopes to achieve a small nucleus of permanent staff who will serve tutorially, instead of having to rely so heavily upon visiting professors from other universities serving on a temporary basis.

There were 30 new students in the institute this year including 2 from the United States; 1 each from Greece, Israel, the United Kingdom, Lebanon, Spain, and the Netherlands West Indies; and a Hungarian refugee. The rest are Easterners, including 22 from India and 8 from Pakistan and 1 Chinese. The goal is to have half Westerners, half Easterners.

Central American Institute of Public Administration

A Central American Institute of Public Administration has been established in San José, Costa Rica, by the United Nations with the cooperation of five Central American countries. Enrique Tejera Paris, Venezuelan management consultant, former teacher at the Brazilian School of Public Administration (Getulio Vargas Foundation), is director. Other members of the permanent staff include Alberto Lopez Gallegor of Venezuela, Pierre Excoule of France, Manuel Sanchez Sarto of Mexico, and Eric Carlson of the United States. They will be assisted in the first course by Maurice Rotibal of France and Fernando Rivera of the Division

of Public Administration, Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations.

The school opened officially January 1, 1954. The first two and one-half months' course, which began in April, is concentrating on municipal and regional planning. A four and one-half months' advanced course will begin in August. There will be a minimum of twenty participants in the first course, and twenty-six in the second course, to be divided equally among the participating countries.

Each of the five cooperating countries will assign three officials to an Advisory Board which will review the director's report each year and serve as a guide on general policy. In each country a National Selection Committee of three (of whom one must be on the Advisory Board) will select the participants, with the exception of Nicaragua where the National Economic Council will act as the National Selection Committee. The officials selected to participate will be granted scholarships to cover their expenses.

Public Administration Institute in Turkey

UNPAITME (United Nations Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East) finished a year of preparatory activity and began its first year of instruction December 1, 1953. The year of preparation included completion of agreements between the United Nations and the Turkish government; financial and physical arrangements for the institute; organization of an Academic Council which is the governing body of the institute, recruitment of experts for the instructional and research staffs; and a "trial run" from March to June, 1953, in which courses were offered to a group of Turkish civil servants.

During the past year, Gunnar Heckscher of the University of Stockholm served as co-director of the institute. The director-general is Yavuz Abadan, dean of the Faculty of Political Science of Ankara University and former member of the Turkish Parliament. Marshall E. Dimock arrived from the United States in November to assume the co-directorship and active charge of the institute.

The teaching staff includes Mr. Dimock (principles of public administration), Lashley G. Harvey of Boston University (organization

and methods), Joseph B. Kingsbury of Indiana University (personnel administration), Abram Mey of the University of the City of Amsterdam (financial administration), E. A. Egli of Zurich (housing and town planning) and the following from Ankara University: Dean Abadan (comparative administration), Tahsin Balta (comparative administrative law), Ahmet Esmer (international relations). Muslih Fer of the Ministry of Labor gives a course in social welfare. A. H. Hanson of Leeds University is director of research, with a special interest in finding source materials and preparing case studies for use in teaching.

Enrollment for the first semester is 160; most students are members of the Turkish civil service. Other nations represented among the students are Ethiopia, Greece, and Iran.

The institute cooperates closely with specialists of the U.S. Foreign Operations Administration and the UN Technical Assistance Board who are working in Turkey. It sees great significance in the fact that, almost without exception, the studies and recommendations of these specialists conclude that Turkey's greatest need is for improved administrative organization and methods to enable the country to realize the economic and social gains it desires.

UNTAAC Fellowships in Public Administration

During the calendar year 1953, there were approximately 97 United Nations Technical Assistance Administration scholars and fellows in the field of public administration. All were either university and college lecturers or experienced administrators. Among the recipients of the UNTAA grants were 12 from Israel; 10 from Indonesia; 9 from Ecuador; 6 each from Haiti and Turkey; 4 each from Brazil and Libya; 3 each from Colombia, Bolivia, Greece, India, Mexico, and the Pacific Islands; 2 each from Egypt, Finland, Jordan, Korea, Paraguay, Syria, British Guiana, and Uruguay; 1 each from Afghanistan, Burma, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Thailand, Sudan, Cyprus, and Samoa.

The United Kingdom was host to 23 of these fellows; France to 17; Canada to 11; the Netherlands and the United States to 9 each; New Zealand and Mexico to 7 each. The rest chose to study in the following countries:

Chile, Italy, Belgium, Turkey, Denmark, Sweden, Australia, Switzerland, Egypt, Austria, Ireland, Pakistan, Brazil, Ceylon, Fiji, and the Philippines. Many of them spent time in more than one country.

Foreign Students in Public Administration

Slightly more than 210 foreign students are enrolled in public administration programs in United States colleges and universities for the academic year 1953-54, according to a census of foreign students compiled by the Committee on Friendly Relations among Foreign Students and the Institute of International Education. Almost two-thirds of these students are located in five universities: New York University, 56; American University, 30; Harvard, 24; University of Southern California, 12; and Syracuse University, 10. The rest are scattered among 37 other institutions in the United States.

The geographical distribution of countries of origin of these students is wide, including 44 from Latin America, 35 from the Near East, 30 from Europe, 30 from Africa, 26 from Southeast Asia, 15 from South Asia, 14 from the Far East, 8 from Canada, 4 from the British West Indies, 3 from the Ryukyus, and 2 from Australia. The largest group from a single country, 22, is from Brazil. There are 15 from Nigeria, 15 from the Philippines, 11 from India, 9 from Turkey, 8 each from Canada and Israel, 7 each from China and Iran, 6 each from British West Africa, United Kingdom, and Ecuador, and 5 each from France, Panama, and Thailand. In some instances the students have come under programs financed by the United Nations or the United States Technical Assistance Program, but in many others they are privately supported or have fellowships from their own governments.

Fulbright Exchanges

York Y. Willbern, director of the Bureau of Public Administration and chairman of the Political Science Department at the University of Alabama, has received a Fulbright professorship at Victoria University College, Wellington, New Zealand, where he reported in March. He will help inaugurate the use of the case method of teaching public administration there. Under the same program, Guy Fox

of Michigan State College is a visiting lecturer at Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan, for the academic year 1953-54.

Two more positions have been created under the Fulbright program for the academic year 1954-55. They are a professorship in public administration at the College of Europe in Bruges, and a predoctoral internship at the International Institute of Administrative Sciences in Brussels. The internship at the International Institute has been awarded to Mrs. Kathleen Rowley Bott, of Ansonia, Connecticut, a Ph.D. candidate at Yale University. Applications for the professorship at Bruges may be addressed to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D. C.

Southeast Asia Conference

The first Regional Conference of the International Federation of Housing and Town Planning in Southeast Asia, held in New Delhi, February 1-5, 1954, brought together over 200 experts in housing and town planning from eight countries in Southeast Asia and a few Middle Eastern countries. The conference was held in conjunction with India's International Low-Cost Housing Exhibition and a UN Seminar on Housing and Community Development. Prime Minister Pandit Nehru gave the opening address.

The conference unanimously voted to establish a continuing regional organization of the International Federation, to hold periodic conferences, and to carry on within the region the work of the International Federation in the exchange of information and experience.

The reports of the sessions emphasized the need for master plans in existing and new towns in the area, to be coordinated with regional and national planning, and for a comprehensive law on town and country planning in each country.

Inter-American Congress of Municipalities

The Vth Inter-American Congress of Municipalities will take place in San Juan, Puerto Rico, December 2-7, 1954. Topics on the agenda are: (1) human relations in municipal government: between the government and its personnel; (2) human relations in municipal government: between the government and its

citizens; (3) good municipal government as an incentive toward greater municipal autonomy; and (4) urban redevelopment.

The congress is under the auspices of the Inter-American Municipal Organization whose headquarters are in Havana, Cuba, and whose membership broadly represents the municipal life of both American continents. The president of the IMO is Mayor German Barbato of Montevideo, Uruguay, the city which was host to the IVth Congress last year; and the secretary general of the IMO is Dr. Carlos M. Moran. The congress, although primarily a meeting of municipalities, is open to all organizations or individuals who are interested in municipal government and administration. Further details may be obtained from the American Committee for International Municipal Cooperation, 1313 East 60 Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

International Housing and Town Planning

The 1954 Congress of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning will begin September 24 in Edinburgh, Scotland. The three main topics for discussion will be slum clearance, national land use planning, and density of residential quarters. These topics are closely related to the on-going projects of the Housing and Town and Country Planning Section of the United Nations Department of Social Affairs. For further information apply to the American Society of Planning Officials or the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

International Institute of Administrative Sciences

The International Institute of Administrative Sciences will hold a summer "round table"

at The Hague July 23-27. Attendance will be limited to members of the Council of Administration and of the standing committees of the institute. The next general triennial Congress of the institute is to be held in 1956. Further information on the institute may be obtained from Secretary, U.S. Section, International Institute of Administrative Sciences, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

The Wallace Clark Center of International Management

The Wallace Clark Center of International Management at New York University is conducting two courses of graduate study, the historical development of scientific management and a seminar in the international management movement. Both are directed by Ernest Dale, who has had industrial experience in Great Britain, Europe, and the United States, has served on the faculties of Yale and Columbia University, and for the past ten years has been a leading associate of the American Management Association.

The center, which was established in 1952 by Mrs. Clark in memory of her husband, serves as a research and survey center and as an orientation point for visiting teams of officials and for U. S. teams bound for service abroad. It also holds bimonthly round tables on current problems in international management which are led by American and foreign authorities in the field.

The center has announced for the academic year 1954-55 two graduate scholarships of \$1,000 in the management field at New York University. Applications should be submitted to Mrs. Wallace Clark at the center by September 1, 1954. The recipients will be expected to help organize Mr. Clark's records of scientific management.

**AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,
STATEMENT OF INCOME, DISBURSEMENTS, AND BALANCE
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1953**

Earned Income:

Memberships and Subscriptions	
Senior Members	\$15,735.00
Junior and Student Members	2,085.25
Sustaining Members	1,182.25
Subscriptions	
Domestic	4,811.00
Foreign	654.75
Total	\$24,468.25
Sales of Journals	654.96
Sales of Reprints	236.69
Sales of Cumulative Indexes	12.00
Journal Advertising	267.87
Miscellaneous Income	152.29
Conference Income	2,765.43
Subvention from Public Administration Clearing House	2,900.00
Total Earned Income	\$31,457.49

Disbursements:

General Operations	
Personal Services	\$15,459.17
Telephone and Telegraph	278.24
Stationery and Supplies	987.09
Furniture and Equipment	193.66
Postage and Express	1,217.79
Mailing Charges	660.21
Printing and Mimeographing	1,113.96
Annual and Other Services	273.04
Accounting Service	660.00
Institutional Memberships	700.00
Conference Expense	1,785.43
Travel Expense	1,326.90
Advertising Expense	
Building Service Fee	939.96
Essay Awards	100.00
Total	\$25,695.45

Public Administration Review

Commissions	\$ 13.40
Postage and Express	260.90
Mailing Charges	193.58
Printing	6,617.35
Reprints	244.95
Cumulative Index	3.40
Total	\$7,333.58

ASPA Newsletter

Printing and Paper	\$ 1,355.41
Postage and Mailing	727.27
Total	\$ 2,082.68
Total Disbursements	\$35,111.71
Deficit	\$ 3,654.22

Balance Carried Forward January

1, 1953	\$ 4,125.29
Excess of Disbursements over Earned Income, 1953	3,654.22
Balance at December 31, 1953	\$ 471.07
Deferred Income (dues paid in 1953 applicable in 1954)	12,568.00
Total Balance and Deferred Income	\$13,039.07

Represented by:

Cash in Banks	\$12,732.99
Petty Cash Fund	25.00
Accounts Receivable	337.00
Clearing Accounts	55.92

Total Cash and Receivables	\$13,039.07
----------------------------	-------------

*For courses in government
regulation of business . . .*

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND PUBLIC POLICY

by Melvin Anshen
Francis D. Wormuth

Here is a broad survey and a critical analysis of all programs—national, state, and local—by which government comes into contact with economic life. Included in the book are accounts of the principal instruments used and an evaluation of their usefulness, descriptions of public policy in major areas, and case reports to illustrate the interaction of government and business. The case studies make it possible to appraise both economic and political factors and to obtain the application of particular techniques in a test case.

Organized in four sections, the first reviews relevant topics in politics, public law, and administration and the second covers techniques of government actions describing the law of trade regulation and containing chapters on licensing; rate, price, and wage fixing; government benefits; taxation; government operations; and business self-government. The third section presents an account of the major areas of public policy in relation to business, and the fourth contains case histories and studies of industrial problems that show policy in concrete, factual settings.

Published in April 472 pp. \$6.75

The Macmillan Company
60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N.Y.